

THE

SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 981, Vol. 38.

August 15, 1874.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

PARLIAMENTARY REPUTATIONS.

THE first Session of a new Parliament suggests the same kind of curiosity which is felt at the early Spring Meeting at Newmarket. It is true that the functions of Parliament extend beyond a trial of the comparative qualities of its members, but personal interest, if less serious and respectable, is not less vivid than political anxiety for the progress of beneficent legislation. The change of Ministry coinciding with the general election left the members of the former Government at liberty to exhibit their speed and training without the impediments of office. On the other hand, some indefatigable members, of whom Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK is the most conspicuous example, have been compelled to earn a novel kind of reputation by unaccustomed silence. If the late Government had remained in office, Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT would not have had the opportunity of meeting Mr. GLADSTONE with varying fortune in more than one direct encounter. Candidates for distinction were encouraged by the withdrawal into private life or into the House of Lords of several veteran members. Mr. BERNAL OSBORNE left vacant a place which has been in some degree filled by Sir WILFRID LAWSON. Mr. BOUVIERIE no longer communicated his knowledge of Parliamentary practice, or criticized with impartial severity the eccentricities of the leaders of his own party. Mr. BRUCE and Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE disappeared from the front Liberal bench; and Mr. CARDWELL inflicted on his friends the serious loss of the only leader who could occupy Mr. GLADSTONE's place in his absence. It is not surprising that among the newly elected members there has not yet appeared a single candidate for Parliamentary distinction. It is still possible that in their ranks may be included future statesmen and orators who have judiciously restrained their ambition while they studied the temper and the rules of the House of Commons. In the present day a large proportion of new members consists of mature or elderly men whose ambition is satisfied by the acquisition of a seat. It is not easy to test the qualifications of younger aspirants, for the days have long gone by when FOX astonished the House at the age of twenty and PITT at twenty-three. The present generation is incredulous of the pretensions of extreme youth to wisdom and practical experience. A rising politician of forty may consider himself unusually lucky in the chance of an early start. Mr. DISRAELI, who once proclaimed in his novels that the world was governed by the young, has lived to find that statesmen past threescore years are liable to the error of rashness and impetuosity rather than to the infirmities of declining age. A gradual advance to influence and power suits the modern English taste better than precocious brilliance or success. The principal members of the Government, and, with one or two exceptions, the leaders of the Opposition, have sat in Parliament for many years.

Among the Ministers, Mr. DISRAELI has fully maintained his established pre-eminence, both by ability in debate and, with one or two remarkable exceptions, by discretion and tact. In office, as in opposition, he has understood better than his great rival that it is not the ordinary duty of a commander-in-chief to come within the line of fire. The PRIME MINISTER took no active part in the conduct of the business of departments. The SECRETARY OF STATE for WAR had the credit of judiciously conforming to the measures of his predecessor, and the FIRST LORD of the ADMIRALTY was personally responsible for the indiscretion of protesting against a phantom fleet, which must still be as unreal as

when he first took office. Mr. CROSS undertook alone the wearisome labour of detailed squabbles about public-houses, and Mr. DISRAELI exhibited a still sounder discretion in leaving the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER to evade or partially fulfil the hasty promises which had been made to the electors of Buckinghamshire. When he rightly thought that it was the duty of the Prime Minister to intervene in the debate on Home Rule, he announced the intention of the Government to maintain the integrity of the United Kingdom in language which was at the same time conciliatory and firm. In the ordinary conduct of the business of the House Mr. DISRAELI has always been judicious and popular; and he would have closed the Session with credit if it had not latterly been devoted to contests on matters in which his real indifference and his assumed zeal of partisanship were equally inappropriate. The belief which he expressed that the opposition to the Endowed Schools Bill was caused by party feeling was but partially correct, though it may perhaps have been thoroughly genuine. The House was reasonably offended by the pretence that he withdrew, because he was unable to understand its provisions, a Bill which he could not carry, and that he had entrusted the conduct of the unintelligible measure to one of his younger colleagues as an opportunity of earning distinction. His subsequent attack on one of the most important members of his own Cabinet was a serious and unaccountable blunder. Mr. DISRAELI, who is not commonly liable to err by excess of zeal, had regarded with indifference, if not with contempt, the ARCHBISHOPS' Bill, of which he afterwards thought fit to become the vehement partisan. The fact that several of his colleagues were opposed to the measure ought at least to have suggested moderation. It would seem that when a statesman of dispassionate temperament resolves to be enthusiastic, he is in danger of overacting his part. Among his colleagues in the Government it is unnecessary to distinguish between the brave GYAS and the brave CLOANTHUS. With the exception of Mr. WARD HUNT's excusable slip, the Ministers discharged their duties creditably, and Mr. HARDY made the best of the embarrassing difference on ecclesiastical questions between himself and Mr. DISRAELI. Mr. LOWTHER had the good fortune as the representative of the Colonial Office to prove that he was something better than a mouthpiece of the Government; and he afforded perhaps a solitary instance of an Under-Secretary who succeeded in a political epigram. Lord GEORGE HAMILTON did his best to interest an indifferent and jaded House in an Indian Budget.

Of the ex-Ministers, in the absence of Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. FORSTER was the most active. His elaborate argument for household suffrage in counties was addressed rather to future constituencies and Parliaments than to a House which heartily shared the aversion of the country to fresh constitutional changes. Some of his colleagues who were present either voted against him or declined to vote; but the advocates of an extended franchise know where they can find a leader, if indeed the Non-conformist portion of their body hereafter forgives Mr. FORSTER's tolerance and firmness. In the debates on the Endowed Schools Bill Mr. FORSTER naturally took a conspicuous share, and on this occasion he found himself in fuller accordance with his party; but, like Mr. GOSCHEN and Mr. LOWE, he is only one of several unrecognized candidates for a succession which happily is not yet vacant. Mr. GOSCHEN, who was not fortunate in the effect of his ingenious attack on Mr. CROSS, has endeavoured in his late speech at Frome to revive the spirit of party or of

faction. Elaborate demonstrations that the Liberals are always right, and the Conservatives always wrong, are not in harmony with the present temper of the country. Mr. GLADSTONE, after announcing a partial retirement, delivered three elaborate speeches in the first week of the Session, and then withdrew from the House until he was recalled by the attraction of ecclesiastical controversy. His first speech on the Public Worship Bill, though it failed to command the support of his party, was worthy of his best days as a Parliamentary orator. His reply to Sir W. HARCOURT in nearly the last debate of the Session was equally vigorous and successful. The greatest speaker in the House of Commons is the same who was the greatest speaker twenty years ago, and it happens by singular fortune that now, as then, Mr. DISRAELI holds the second place. The two great champions have not during the recent Session engaged in a pitched battle, though Mr. DISRAELI, relying on a great majority on both sides of the House, would gladly have engaged Mr. GLADSTONE on the Resolutions which were afterwards prudently withdrawn. It may be hoped that the renewed excitement of Parliamentary combat will have prevailed over Mr. GLADSTONE's inclination for repose. It is doubtful whether he will be able to reunite the Liberal party which he has broken up by his restless energy, but no Government will be indolent or careless while Mr. GLADSTONE leads the Opposition.

The latest victim of Mr. GLADSTONE's prowess has no reason to be ashamed of his defeat, though he may perhaps regret the temerity which provoked it. In all legendary cycles there is some supreme hero so irresistible that it is only difficult to conjecture how he found antagonists to sustain his reputation. It was no disgrace to be overthrown by ACHILLES, by ORLANDO, by SIEGFRIED, or by LANCELOT. Sir W. HARCOURT thought fit to tilt with Mr. GLADSTONE, and he has been rewarded by a heavy fall. Unfriendly critics have no difficulty in showing that there was a defect of taste as well as of prudence in attacking the chief of his party; nor is extreme and ostentatious zeal for Parliamentary Protestantism, and for the subordination of Church to State, a proof of thoughtful and prophetic wisdom. The copious display of erudition which had evidently but a few hours before been reposing harmless and unknown on its shelves produces little rhetorical impression; and indeed the defects of Sir W. HARCOURT's late speeches are so numerous and so undeniable that their qualified success can only be explained by the vigour and Parliamentary aptitude of the speaker. Six years ago Sir W. HARCOURT had never entered the House of Commons in which he is now one of the foremost debaters. The position which he holds, though his rank may not be exactly determined, is the prize of his bow and spear, and not the reward of the popular arts which sometimes win temporary favour. With longer experience he will perhaps learn the insecurity of applause which is earned by the adoption of passing popular delusions. The occupant of a recognized place in Parliament will be less liable to the temptations which beset aspirants. There may perhaps be silent members of Parliament of greater historical learning and of more cautious political judgment; but legislative assemblies, while they respect wisdom, are immediately controlled by energy and eloquence. Mr. FAWCETT, whose return to the House after a short interval of exclusion was generally welcomed, displayed courageous independence in his opposition to a part of Mr. CROSS's Factory Bill, and he made more than one powerful speech against the Endowed Schools Bill. Among members whose characteristic faculties have ripened late, Sir WILFRID LAWSON has lately become remarkable for a playful humour which appears not to be inconsistent with earnest and even extreme opinions. Implacable hostility to standing armies, to alcohol, and to colonial extension clashes with the feelings of the great majority of the House; yet the most zealous advocate of unpopular heresies is always heard with pleasure, if not with assent. Sir WILFRID LAWSON's analysis of the population of the Fiji Islands, and his description of the drunken chief of an extinct savage tribe, were the best parts of a not uninteresting debate. Among the Irish members, Mr. BUTT has displayed his accustomed fluency and facility, and Mr. SULLIVAN has been recognized as a speaker of oratorical promise. At the close of the Session the Home Rule members imprudently compromised by perverse obstinacy the credit which they had previously acquired by their disciplined moderation.

THE BOMBAY RIOTS.

A PARLIAMENTARY Paper has recently been published containing despatches to and from India on the subject of some riots which took place there in the early part of the present year, and the history they contain illustrates in one or two curious points the kind of minor difficulties with which the Government of India is beset. For a long time a feud has been going on between the Mahometan and Parsee populations in Bombay, and its smouldering fires burst into a flame in February last. The cause of the outbreak was an expression in a notice of the *Life of MAHOMET* published by a Parsee, which the Mahometans considered to be derogatory to the memory or reputation of one of MAHOMET's concubines. The Parsees pointed out subsequently that the very expression had long ago been used of the same person in a Christian tract circulated in Bombay. But Christians, although dogs in the eyes of faithful Mussulmans, are big strong dogs, and an expression which is used by a big dog without offence may awaken burning indignation when used by such very little and such very odious dogs as the Parsees are held to be by their Mahometan fellow-subjects in India. The Commissioner of Police attempted to remove the cause of evil by inviting the author of the book to deposit with him the unissued copies, and by inviting all those who were possessed of copies to deposit them too. His invitations were respectfully attended to, and the book was withdrawn from circulation. Lord SALISBURY thinks that the Commissioner did not do enough. He ought to have foreseen that the book, although suppressed, would lead to a riot. Whether any one could have foreseen a riot under such circumstances is difficult to say; but at any rate the riot came, some houses of the Parsees were sacked, two fire-temple were desecrated, several wounds inflicted, and one life lost. The Commissioner of Police, however, directly the riot began, exerted himself with a vigour and gallantry which have received a warm tribute of praise from Lord SALISBURY. The disturbance was soon quelled, and sixty-four prisoners were taken. The next day a deputation of Parsees waited on Sir PHILIP WODEHOUSE, the Governor, and asked him to protect them by the use, or rather the show, of an adequate military force. Sir PHILIP WODEHOUSE gave a most remarkable answer. In the first place he said that he should not have anything to do with soldiers until it had been proved that the police were unable to keep the peace; and in the next place he asked whether the Parsees were really such poor creatures that they could not do something to defend themselves. On the following day a large funeral procession of Mahometans took place, and a much more serious riot occurred, in which many were wounded, and five killed, and on this occasion the Parsees were the aggressors. After this serious outbreak the troops were called out, and no further disturbance of any moment arose. Directly the troops appeared on the scene not only was the ordinary state of peace immediately restored, but the Government forbade the usual annual procession of the Mohurram, without the Mahometans venturing to give any outward signs of their disappointment.

The point of real interest in the case was whether the Governor of BOMBAY acted rightly. He stated what his view of his duties was in writing home on the subject, and expressly asked to be informed whether he was right or not. He took a purely English view of the matter, obeyed the traditions of English law, and avowedly acted as if the disturbance had taken place in Whitechapel. His two maxims were that British subjects have a right to defend themselves when illegally attacked, and that the military force ought to be kept entirely in the background until it has been proved practically that the civil force is inadequate to the calls made on it. What he would have done in London or Bristol, that he held he ought to do, not a bit less or a bit more, in Bombay. Lord NORTHBROOK first appears in the despatches as commenting on these views of the GOVERNOR, and then Lord SALISBURY takes up and puts with clearness and force what Lord NORTHBROOK had said. The criticism of Lord NORTHBROOK and Lord SALISBURY simply comes to this—India is not England, nor at all like England; and it is impossible to govern the natives of India as Englishmen are governed or govern themselves. Lord NORTHBROOK states that in India, on the first apprehension of any serious riot, the right course is to assemble such a military force as will show those who are disposed to break the peace that any attempt of the kind must be ineffectual, and to make use of

that force promptly if occasion should require it. Hesitation and delay, as Lord NORTHBROOK points out, involve great danger under such circumstances, as the character of the population of Indian cities must be taken into consideration, and the very serious consequences must never be lost sight of which might flow from any appearance of inability on the part of the Executive Government to put down disturbances. The Indian Government must, as Lord SALISBURY puts it, repress with unfaltering hand the first beginnings of disorder. Compared to the primary importance of this duty, the question whether it should be performed by civil or military agency must take a secondary rank. Nothing is gained by looking on passively while the curious problem is settled whether the police will or will not beat the rioters. The natives of India have no more objection to be kept in order by soldiers than by policemen; and if the police are defeated and the soldiers then restore order, it is the Government that in their eyes loses the first battle and wins the second. Lord SALISBURY has given the GOVERNOR the explicit instructions he requested, and for the future we shall not hear of Indian authorities waiting to call troops out until the police seem on the point of breaking down. Not that Sir PHILIP WODEHOUSE was to be blamed for holding the opinion he did and acting on it. He was quite right if he really had no more powers in Bombay than he would have had if he had been a magistrate acting in England. What his powers actually were seems to have then been in some doubt, for Lord SALISBURY concludes by saying that for the future there can be no doubt about them, as certain sections of the Criminal Code have been recently extended to the Presidency towns. Even, however, where these sections do not operate, Indian officials will henceforth know that they will be supported by their superiors if they use all the force at their disposal to repress anything that tends to break the public peace, and this knowledge will give them the confidence which is necessary when a sudden emergency arises.

The duty of the authorities in cases of apprehended disturbance is not, however, the only point on which these despatches throw light. There is a financial matter, accidentally noticed in them, which is of considerable importance. The Governor of BOMBAY assigned as his reason for calling in the military when he did, that the police, whose reduced numbers had been shown to be insufficient for the control of the vast population of the city under unusual pressure, were worn out with fatigue and unable to do their duty. The Commissioner of Police subsequently stated that in 1864 the General Inspector of Police recommended, and the Government sanctioned his opinion, that a certain force which he described should be accepted as the minimum of what was absolutely necessary to preserve the peace of Bombay, and yet this number was subsequently reduced by more than a hundred men. The Commissioner also pointed out that his men were under a great disadvantage from having no barracks, so that, if any sudden emergency arose, they had to be gathered together from the different quarters where they resided. Sir PHILIP WODEHOUSE wrote to Lord SALISBURY three months after the riots to say that the Bombay Government was fully sensible of its obligations, and much wished to see the police force increased. But it was unfortunately placed in a very delicate and embarrassing position. It had not got the requisite funds, and no contribution whatever was made from Imperial or provincial sources. The allotment received by Bombay under the decentralization scheme was so scanty that the charge for the proper amount to maintain an adequate police force could not be met; and although the Bombay Government had recently made a suggestion by which its funds would be increased, this suggestion had been negatived by the GOVERNOR-GENERAL in Council. Such was the picture drawn by the Governor of BOMBAY, and a very touching picture it was. But then came Lord NORTHBROOK's turn, and he gave Lord SALISBURY his account of the deplorable destitution of Bombay. When, in 1870, the Provincial Service system was commenced, the Central Government had to consider what aid it should give to Bombay, and what Bombay needed. Among other sums, an amount of 10,000*l.* a year was given specially as a contribution in aid of the Bombay police. But it is part of the new scheme to give the money in a lump, and let the Provincial Government spend it as it pleases. The Bombay Government in the exercise of this discretion chose to take away the

10,000*l.* a year from the police and apply it to other purposes, and now with admirable coolness it says that not a farthing is given in aid of the police. It is true that the Bombay Government recently made a suggestion for getting more money, and it is also true that the suggestion was negatived; but then this suggestion was that a provincial Income-tax should be levied in the Bombay Presidency in order to carry on a high rate of expenditure upon public works, mainly consisting of civil buildings. This was the grand scheme of the Bombay Government, to the failure of which the inadequacy of its police force was in its opinion to be attributed. It is obvious that, unless Lord NORTHBROOK had been firm, the decentralization scheme would have been a mere farce. The local Government gets money for its police, spends the money on its favourite public works, and then says that the peace of the city cannot be preserved because no contribution is made towards the cost of a sufficient body of police. Evidently the Government of Bombay is as yet at the very beginning of its financial education. It is full of the memories of old times. It cannot believe that it may not get money for one thing, spend it on another, and then ask for fresh supplies to carry out the original object. After this striking illustration it is easy to understand some of the difficulties which press most hardly on Indian financiers.

MR. GOSCHEN AT FROME.

MR. GOSCHEN is a young and active member of the Liberal party. He has been in office and would like to be in office again. He wishes to be a great party leader, and wants to see his party once more powerful and rising from its present state of depression and incoherence. He is perhaps better calculated than any of the other colleagues of Mr. GLADSTONE to perform the useful office of rallying fainthearted or dissentient Liberals, and of persuading them that they are still powerful and have a great game before them if they only know how to play it. He does not go too far down into things; he can put together a number of statements many of which are nearly true; he is not afraid of a grand fight, and he enjoys abusing his opponents. This is exactly the sort of man who is wanted to appear on provincial scenes, to keep up the spirit of attorneys, to win a laugh and a cheer at a public meeting, and to make Liberals attend to the registration, and even begin to whisper that after all Mr. GLADSTONE is a very great man. At Frome he wisely opened what he had to say by frankly acknowledging that the country was weary of him and of his colleagues, and that it was high time they should go out of office. This unfortunate state of things he ascribed to two causes—to the corroding effects of time, which eats through every reputation, and teaches men to foster their ingratitude for benefits received, and to grow sick of hearing ARISTIDES called the Just; and, in the second place, to a natural perversity of the human heart which makes people call the same things good if done by Conservatives and bad if done by Liberals. Of course, when the Executive had become as weak and as unpopular as Mr. GOSCHEN admits it had become before Mr. GLADSTONE left office, it was right that there should be a change of Ministry, and of course it is an advantage that there should be, as at present, a complete harmony between the Executive and the country. But then no party need be ashamed of having been at length beaten by the operation of time and human perversity. This was a much more cheery way of putting things, and much more calculated to animate local Liberal spirit, than if Mr. GOSCHEN had been foolish enough to recognize that the downfall of the GLADSTONE Cabinet was mainly due to its own extraordinary blunders. The present task of young and active Liberal leaders is to make every one, and especially their simple-hearted personal admirers, forget that Lord ABERDARE's first Licensing Bill frightened the great beer interest into a legitimate panic; that the House of Lords, after being invited to pronounce whether purchase should be abolished, was summarily overruled by the issue of a Royal Warrant; and that cautious men got alarmed at the proceedings of a Prime Minister who bribed the constituencies with an offer to remit the Income-tax, who leant with little disguise to the disestablishment of the National Church, and who could not even make up his mind as to what Home Rule meant. All these things were ignored, and wisely ignored,

at Frome. The Liberal party is to make a fresh start, and it may very properly try to begin it by burying its dead past.

The conduct of the present Ministry is very trying to Mr. GOSCHEN. It will persist in not making the mistakes which, on principle, it ought to make. It has not yielded to the spirit of Conservative reaction. It has not attempted to undo the great measures of its predecessors. It submits to the influence of Mr. DISRAELI and Lord CAIRNS. It has been studiously civil and courteous to its late opponents. Mr. GOSCHEN does not like all this civility and courtesy, and he tried to bring things into a healthier state by his attack on Mr. CROSS. Why, as he asked at Frome, should he not attack Mr. CROSS, if he pleases? The Conservatives put no limits on their abuse when they were out of office, and now that he is out of office why should he not be as abusive as a Conservative? There is no reason, unless it is a reason that, in the trying time which follows a change of Ministry, the successful party which puts off the air of triumph, does justice to the merits of its predecessors, and uniformly uses conciliatory language, should be met in the same spirit. There is, however, as Mr. GOSCHEN pointed out, every prospect that so long as Mr. DISRAELI retains his hold on his followers, and humours the prevailing wish of the country for a mild and moderate Liberalism, he will hold a position that will not be very easily shaken. But there is a silver lining to every cloud, and even in the dark prospect of Mr. DISRAELI's contriving to understand what he is about, the Liberals of Frome might see a gleam of light. There is a hope, a very slight hope perhaps—but still enough to make a streak of sweet comfort—that Mr. DISRAELI's Cabinet will break up through internal dissensions. Have they not already begun to quarrel, and has not Mr. DISRAELI abused Lord SALISBURY in the House of Commons? This is no doubt cheering in its way, but provincial Liberals must be on their guard against being too much comforted by it. Mr. DISRAELI certainly did abuse Lord SALISBURY, and made a considerable mistake in doing so, for he forgot his usual courtesy towards those with whom he acts, and he had not taken the pains to inquire whether Lord SALISBURY had really laid himself open to such an attack, even if due consideration for the feelings of a colleague would have permitted it. But Cabinets do not break up for such reasons, unless they break up at the time when the sense of offence is hottest. Mr. GOSCHEN owned that there were considerable differences of opinion among the members of Mr. GLADSTONE's Cabinet, which differences are showing themselves freely now that there is no longer any occasion for concert and agreement. Still, Mr. GLADSTONE's Cabinet lasted five years, and, as Mr. GOSCHEN states, there was no trace of disagreement in it while it lasted. Sensible men sink minor differences in order to carry out a common object; and if sensible Liberals do this, the Conservatives may have the sense to imitate their example. The triumph of opponents over the dissensions of a Cabinet is, indeed, very likely to defeat its own end. Mr. GOSCHEN tries to make the most of the quarrel—if it was a quarrel—between Lord SALISBURY and Mr. DISRAELI. But why does he do this and pat Lord SALISBURY on the back and hold him up to reverence as the one stout-hearted Conservative who refuses to be educated by Mr. DISRAELI? Not certainly to please Lord SALISBURY, but to stimulate him to break up the present Cabinet, and let Mr. GOSCHEN and his friends come into office and carry measures of which Lord SALISBURY would totally disapprove. This is a manoeuvre which in party warfare is quite fair, but it is a very patent manoeuvre, and Lord SALISBURY is as capable of seeing through it as any one else.

But the possible dissensions of the Cabinet are not all that Mr. GOSCHEN bids Liberals look to. The Government is only in harmony with the country because Mr. DISRAELI keeps on educating his party; but Mr. GOSCHEN cannot believe that Conservatives are susceptible of education to an indefinite degree. There must be something sooner or later which they will not stand, and then Mr. DISRAELI will be forsaken by his followers, and honest Liberals will have their own again. Meanwhile, if the Liberal party take Mr. GOSCHEN's very sensible advice, it will not offer any factious opposition, it will not exaggerate such small mistakes as its opponents may commit. It will rather aim at seeing that the Government is kept up to its present Liberal mark, and will concentrate its energies on ensuring that the Liberals shall retain all they won when Mr. GLADSTONE was in power. This is excellent advice, and Liberals cannot do better than follow it. But it is not very obvious

how this prudent and praiseworthy conduct will weaken the hands of Mr. DISRAELI. A Conservative Government which adopts a moderate Liberal policy and appropriates or invents moderate Liberal measures has two great advantages. It pleases the country, which is on the whole distinctly Liberal, but Liberal in a modest and cautious way. And it pleases, or at any rate does not displease, the bulk of its own followers, who like to have a popular Ministry of their own party in office, and who ingeniously throw the blame of a Liberalism which they perhaps think excessive on the Opposition. Mr. CROSS has done much less for the publicans than they expected, and probably much less than he expected to do for them. But the publicans do not blame him or his colleagues for this shortcoming; they lay it at the door of pestilent meddlesome Liberals, who would not let the real friends of beer show all the friendliness to strong liquor that lies at the bottom of their noble hearts. The Conservatives, too, are a very well-disciplined party, and they ask not that their leaders shall be as Conservative as is desirable, but only that they shall be as Conservative as is possible. They have been a long time out of office, and they are very willing that Mr. DISRAELI and Lord CAIRNS should show them how to keep office now that at length they have got it. It will greatly assist the process if there is found something that deserves the name of a Liberal Opposition; and if Mr. GOSCHEN has his way, and so far inspirits his friends as to make them imitate him in lavishing personal abuse, he will give the majority much pleasant excitement, and abundant opportunities of indulging that fine natural gift for cheering and hooting which is known to distinguish so many ardent Conservatives, but which this Session has lain almost dormant in consequence of their uncertainty as to what Mr. DISRAELI wished to have cheered and what he wished to have hooted. They may very naturally not take in precisely what he means, but they will comprehend in a moment when he or his colleagues are abused. Besides, a coherent Liberal Opposition will be of great service to Mr. DISRAELI as an indicator of what the country really wants. He does not care a straw about pleasing the Conservatives, but he cares very much for pleasing the country. At present he only guesses what the country wants; for there is no Opposition between which and him the country decides. The harder Mr. GOSCHEN works, if he goes on as he has begun and as he proposes to go on, the more he will for a time keep the Cabinet in harmony, and enable Mr. DISRAELI to see which way to steer. In the long run other results will no doubt be seen to have been attained. The Liberal party will have regained its character for common sense and prudence, will have shaken off dangerous alliances, will have united under a leader, and made itself strong in the constituencies. But some time must elapse before this can take place, and at the outset Mr. GOSCHEN and those whom he can persuade to act with him are more likely to strengthen than to weaken the Ministry.

FRANCE.

THE escape of M. BAZAINE is not in itself a matter of any importance. Even if the Bonapartists were in a position to need a general, they would hardly entrust the chief command to a man so little popular with the army as the ex-MARSHAL. Their journals defended him at the time of his trial as much perhaps from the fear of possible revelations on his part as from any real zeal for his acquittal, and the best service he can now render to his party is to remain in the obscurity for which, in spite of his sudden rise and his tremendous fall, nature apparently designed him. But the escape of so notorious a prisoner is certainly unfortunate for the reputation of Marshal MACMAHON's Government. Throughout its many political failures it has put forward one claim to the respect of Frenchmen—that of being a strong Government. It might be played with in Parliament, but it could not be played with out of Parliament. It now appears that, to whomsoever else it is formidable, it has no terrors for its own hired servants; all that is known about M. BAZAINE's escape points to the conclusion that it was effected with the connivance of his gaolers, and gaolers are usually the class who best appreciate, because they best know, the character of their employers. Madame BAZAINE was liberal no doubt in her offers, but it is seldom that money has much charm for a man who feels that the chances are infinitely against his ever living to spend it. It may seem

hard to attach discredit to Marshal MACMAHON for the conduct of inferiors whose names he has never heard. But there is no getting over the fact that strong Governments have a way of inspiring dread in their most distant subordinates, and that, when this sentiment is markedly wanting, it is a fair inference that the qualities which are supposed to create it are wanting also. Indeed it matters but little whether the inference is fair or unfair, for, whichever it is, it will not the less be drawn. Marshal MACMAHON's Government may be the victim, as regards M. BAZAINE, of undeserved misfortune, but the opinion which Frenchmen will form of it will certainly be less compassionate. They will be inclined to say that a Government which cannot obtain from the Legislature the powers that it has itself declared to be essential, which cannot control the strife of parties or find a single politician willing to take office under it, and which in two conspicuous instances has proved itself unable to keep its prisoners under lock and key, must be a very weak Government indeed. This is not exactly the character with which it will be convenient for Marshal MACMAHON and his Ministers to meet the Assembly next November.

There is another view that may be taken of M. BAZAINE's escape which, though certainly untrue, may not for that reason be the less injurious to the Government. Frenchmen are naturally suspicious, and treachery is the explanation which most often suggests itself when any misfortune happens to them. The Government has been suspected of Bonapartist tendencies before now, and it is not unlikely that this suspicion will fasten itself with increased intensity upon the facts that the leading Bonapartist general has been condemned to death, has had his sentence commuted, has been treated with remarkable leniency during his imprisonment, and has finally been allowed to escape. Of course no one whose judgment is worth considering will come to this conclusion, but then the mass of every nation is composed of persons whose judgments are individually not worth considering. It is not the real evidences of complicity with a political party that make most impression on them, but some superficial symptom which strikes their fancy as having some occult meaning which never belonged to it. There was a time when to have been suspected of Bonapartist leanings would have been the worst fate that could have befallen a French Government, but this cannot be said now. It is not at all clear that the charge of conniving at M. BAZAINE's escape, even if it is generally believed by the more ignorant part of the population, will make Marshal MACMAHON's Government unpopular. It is quite possible that the effect of it may be to strengthen the belief that the Empire will some day be restored, that Marshal MACMAHON foresees this as clearly as other people, and that he is shaping his conduct accordingly. This is the sort of impression which Bonapartist agents ought to be able to make a good deal of, and, if they come upon any traces of it, they may be trusted not to let the occasion go unimproved. It is just possible that this state of things may somewhat alter the attitude of the Government towards the Left Centre. The composition of the present Cabinet is supposed to be strongly anti-Imperialist, and the suspicion of Bonapartism will consequently be one of which the Ministers will be extraordinarily impatient. In this frame of mind they will be disposed to look about them for some means of convincing the country of its blunder. Measures of administrative severity will hardly serve their purpose, partly because the Bonapartist agents will have sense enough to be exceedingly careful not to give the authorities any excuse for taking steps against them, and partly because proceedings of this kind are very easily represented as being mere blunders. The measure which would most dash the reviving hopes of the Imperialists would be the establishment of a genuinely Conservative Republic; and if the MARSHAL and his Cabinet should see this at the eleventh hour, they may be inclined to revive M. CASIMIR-PÉRIER's motion in order completely to dissociate themselves from a system which they dislike even more than they dislike the Republic.

If any lingering hopes of reconstructing the old Conservative majority have survived the Session, they must be destroyed by the remarkable outspokenness of the Legitimists. They have insisted on dragging the extraordinary humility of the Right Centre into the full light of day. Whatever other faults this party may possess, it is certainly singularly free from undue sensitiveness. Every time that it has been smitten it has turned the other cheek to the assailant, and asked for the honour of a second blow. There is, we sup-

pose, a point at which even an Orleanist would turn, but where that point is has not been discovered. The Extreme Right have done their best to find it out, but as yet each new insult has only provoked a fresh act of submission. The last turn of the roller has been administered by M. BENAZET, the President of a "Congress" of provincial Royalist newspapers. In a letter to his brother editors he sets out at length the occasions on which the policy of the Right Centre has been thwarted by the Extreme Right. He goes back to the end of April, when these same journalists dared to set up the banner of France in the presence of the men who had rejected their King because he had refused to accept the banner of the Revolution. He reminds his colleagues that at the very time when the Duke of BROGLIE was preparing to organize the Septennate, they conjured the Royalist deputies not to vote any of the constitutional laws which the Ministry were about to submit to them, and that fifteen days later the Duke of BROGLIE fell through the action of the Extreme Right. Notwithstanding this, the Government of Marshal MACMAHON did not renounce the idea of organization. The President of the REPUBLIC appeared on the scene in person. Then followed in quick succession, the review with the Order of the Day, the imperative Message, the orders carried by M. DE FOURTON to the Commission of Thirty, the suspension of the *Union*. All this parade came to nothing, owing to the constancy of the Extreme Right. The Government, continues M. BENAZET, has been driven to take refuge in an adjournment which it had at first refused. It has covered its retreat by an attack upon the Republic, but every victory gained over the Republic is a victory for the Extreme Right. By forcing Marshal MACMAHON to quarrel with the Republicans, they have destroyed the best chance that the Septennate had of establishing itself. This analysis of the second half of the late Session has the merit of being entirely true. M. BENAZET claims no praise for his friends to which they are not justly entitled. The labours of the Assembly have come to nothing because the deputies of the Extreme Right have so determined. They have willed that no constitutional laws should be passed, and none have been passed. They have willed that the Duke of BROGLIE should cease to be Minister, and he has been turned out of office. They have willed that no more business should be done this Session, and General DE CISEY has become suddenly convinced of the Assembly's need for repose. The power of the Extreme Right is beyond dispute. Every other party in the Assembly has been obliged to see its wishes go unfulfilled. The Republicans cannot organize the Republic, the Right Centre cannot organize the Septennate. But the Extreme Right, which was equally bent upon defeating both proposals, has been able to defeat both.

It must be clear, one would think, to the least intelligent member of the Right Centre that a party which expresses itself in this way, just at the moment when the Duke of BROGLIE is about to move heaven and earth to bring the Right Centre and the Extreme Right into agreement, is absolutely resolved to make no concessions. The temper of the Legitimists has become more unbending in proportion as their hopes have grown fainter. They never had less chance than they have now of placing the Count of CHAMBORD on the throne, and they never were less inclined to offer practicable terms to the allies without whose co-operation their prospects can never be any better than they are. It seems incredible that the Right Centre can long go on expecting to change a determination which only grows stronger under adverse circumstances. Perhaps the cessation of these hopes may lead the party to support Marshal MACMAHON if he should be induced by other considerations to make a move in the direction of the Republic.

RAILWAY DIVIDENDS.

NEARLY all the great English Companies have announced their dividends for the half-year; and the prospects of shareholders will not be rendered more cheerful by the forthcoming Reports of the Scotch Companies. The collective loss, as compared with the corresponding periods of 1872 and 1873, is heavy, though the decline had been anticipated. The dividends of the most prosperous lines, such as the North-Eastern, the North-Western, the Lancashire and Yorkshire, and the Midland, have fallen by an average amount of $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. per annum. As the ordinary stock of these four Companies exceeds 80,000,000*l.*, the income of the proprietors for the half-year

is reduced by 500,000*l.* The dividends on Preference Stock and the interest on Debenture Stock are of course unaffected by the stagnation of traffic and the increase of working expenses. Less flourishing Companies suffer in a much larger proportion. The Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Company pays at the rate of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on 4,000,000*l.* of ordinary stock; the North Staffordshire Company at 1 per cent. on more than 3,000,000*l.* In both cases a small diminution of receipts would have left the shareholders without an income, and would perhaps have prevented full payment of the preference dividends. The Great Eastern Company pays no dividend on upwards of 8,000,000*l.* of stock; and a part of the preference dividend has not been paid. The needier class of proprietors will suffer severe hardship; and if the depression continues, the railway service will certainly not be improved. Shareholders will derive faint consolation from the probable suspension of the popular clamour to which they are subjected during seasons of prosperity. It can scarcely be expected even by railway theorists that lines should be unnecessarily doubled at a moment when the capital already expended produces little or no return. The Board of Trade itself will perhaps be inclined to reconsider its approval of the proposal that all existing tariffs shall, as Mr. WAIT lately suggested, be summarily abolished, to be replaced by rates arbitrarily fixed by the Railway Commissioners. The Legislatures of some of the Western American States lately attempted to violate in the same manner the conditions on which capitalists have provided for the public benefit the means of railway construction. It may be hoped that the Parliament of the United Kingdom is not prepared for a similar confiscation of property merely because it happens to be held in shares and not in bulk. Railway proprietors have no right to complain of the vicissitudes which attend their speculation; but when their pockets are empty they are, according to the Latin adage, entitled to sing in the presence of the would-be robber at the Board of Trade or elsewhere. The tradition of liberality and efficiency is so fully established among directors and railway managers that much provocation and discouragement will be required before they can be induced to reduce the standard of accommodation to a Continental level; but railway reformers ought to remember that there are limits to the endurance of shareholders who receive 1 per cent. on their investments. On the other side, Railway Boards would be well advised to anticipate legislative interference by abandoning some practices which are the more perverse because they are wholly unprofitable. There is no reason why railway tickets should not be obtainable at any time which may suit the convenience of passengers; and in many cases neighbouring Companies might time their trains to suit one another more conveniently than at present. Vexatious drawbacks to the admirable organization of the English railway system produce a prejudice altogether disproportionate to their number and magnitude.

Although trade and manufacturing industry have thus far shown few indications of recovery, some of the causes which have produced a diminution of railway dividends already tend to disappear. The cost of steel rails has fallen from 17*l.* to 11*l.* per ton; and the cost of iron rails from 11*l.* to 8*l.* The whole difference in price is not a clear gain to Railway Companies, because the value of the old iron is diminished in the same proportion; but the excessive price of iron and steel has been one considerable element of the recent increase in working expenses. The reduction in the price of coal will affect for the first time the expenditure of the current half-year, for nearly all the Companies had unavoidably bound themselves by contracts which have only now expired. The contracts which are now in force are probably founded on a reduction of not less than 50 per cent. The weekly expenditure of the large Companies on coals is so large that some of them will save from 2,000*l.* to 4,000*l.* per week by the diminution on prices. A saving of 3,000*l.* is equivalent to an increase of 6,000*l.* in the weekly traffic returns, because the gross receipts are subject to a deduction of 50 per cent. for working expenses. As the whole benefit of reduction in the price of coal will accrue in solvent Companies to the ordinary shareholders, they may reasonably expect for the next year an average increase of 1 per cent. in their dividends. Although it can scarcely be expected that the price of coal will revert to its former level, there is no reason to apprehend an early return of the dearth of 1873. The enormous profits made at that time by coalowners gave a strong

impulse to mining enterprise, and in many places preparations have been made for bringing the coal of the deeper seams for the first time into the market. The capital which has already been expended on new pits affords a guarantee that within two or three years the supply will be largely increased; and there is no reason for expecting a corresponding addition to the demand. Even if the iron trade resumes its former activity, the abnormal disturbance of the price of coal will probably not be repeated. The colliers, whose industry varies inversely with its remuneration, have everywhere submitted to a considerable reduction of wages, and consequently it may be hoped that their labour will once more become comparatively regular and efficient. Their efforts to stint the supply of coals by arbitrary rules of their own may perhaps continue to exercise a pernicious influence. Another cause of the late increase in working expenses remains for the present in full operation. The Railway Companies have hitherto made no attempt to reduce the wages of the men in their employment. It is possible that they may receive some compensation for increased expenditure in efficiency of service and in security against combinations for advance of wages. It is doubtful whether Mr. GLADSTONE's advice to his fellow-shareholders in the Metropolitan District Railway is not founded on too vague a generalization. Railway Companies have found by varied experience that the most profitable rates seldom coincide with either the highest or the lowest rates. Their best customers as passengers are the middle classes, who live in one place and conduct their business in another. Mr. GLADSTONE perhaps felt a delicacy as a shareholder in relieving the suburban railways from the monstrous injustice of a tax from which omnibuses and river steamboats are exempt.

In the case of some Companies the apparently large reduction of dividend is due to a change in financial arrangements, or in the mode of keeping the accounts. The balances carried on to the next half-year ought to be compared with the corresponding amounts in former years if it is desired to make a strictly accurate comparison. One or two Companies have but lately conformed to the law which prohibits the payment of interest out of capital on unproductive outlay. The restriction is in itself purely artificial, and it has been imposed, at Lord REDESDALE's instance, with the express purpose of discouraging railway enterprise. Private capitalists would in the ordinary course of business charge all the costs of an improvement on the expected returns, nor is there any reason why shareholders in a joint-stock undertaking should be subjected to special disabilities. Unfortunately any member of a Company, acting perhaps in the interest of a hostile competitor, may enforce, by proceedings in equity, the strict observance of the law. The payment of interest out of revenue derived from the existing undertaking ultimately involves neither loss nor gain to the proprietors, although it often causes extreme and unreasonable inconvenience to those who are temporarily deprived of their income. Where the net revenue is, as in the case of the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Company, almost entirely absorbed by the interest on unproductive works, it is only by an elaborate calculation that it becomes possible to estimate the value of the whole undertaking. The Chairman of the Sheffield Company stated at the general meeting that, but for the operation of Lord REDESDALE's rule, the dividend would have been at the rate of $4\frac{1}{2}$ instead of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. The Midland Company, which is better able to bear the burden, has to provide interest on a much larger capital invested in lines which at present yield no return. The Settle and Carlisle Railway, of which the completion has been unavoidably delayed, has cost between two or three millions, which will in two or three years produce an ample return. In the meantime the charge of 50,000*l.* a year on the receipts of the rest of the system evidently bears no nearer relation to the value of the productive lines than if it were the cost of a coal-pit or a cotton factory in which the profits of another industrial undertaking might have been invested. The numerous lines which are now in course of construction will create additional traffic for the owning Companies, but they will also, and to a greater extent, produce a diversion of existing traffic. By means of the Settle and Carlisle line the Midland Company will appropriate a large share of the Scotch West Coast traffic, which now exclusively belongs to the London and North-Western. The Midland, the Great Northern, and the Manchester and Sheffield have, by

their joint undertaking of the Cheshire lines, already begun to divide the Liverpool trade with the London and North-Western and the Lancashire and Yorkshire. The Great Northern and the London and North-Western have promoted competing lines from the North and South into Leicestershire, which had been the special preserve of the Midland; and the London and North-Western will have the free use of a line which the Great Northern is constructing side by side with the Midland line into the heart of the Derbyshire coal-field. The Midland Company has by the legislation of the present year obtained access to the coal-fields and ports of South Wales, of which the traffic had been hitherto divided between the London and North-Western and the Great Western. Whatever may be the advantages of competition to Railway Companies, there can be no doubt that it is universally desired by freighters and by trading communities. For some years past competing lines have been projected and authorized with unceasing activity, although some districts form an exception to the general practice. The three Companies which occupy the South-Eastern counties have lately concluded a three years' truce, and the North-Eastern Company reigns undisturbed over North Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland. An estimate of the prospects of a Railway Company requires almost as complicated a calculation as the determination of the movements of a planet. It is necessary to take into account not only the original velocity and the centripetal force, but the attraction which is exercised, in proportion to their mass and proximity, by all the other adjacent or competing bodies.

SEÑOR CASTELAR.

SEÑOR CASTELAR has after a long interval returned to active public life by delivering at Malaga a speech which probably loses the greater part of its value in an abridged English version. Although comparisons of the oratory of different countries and languages are but indefinite and conjectural, it is probable that, as a master of impassioned and ornate rhetoric, CASTELAR surpasses all contemporary rivals. A summary of the principal propositions of one of his speeches is as unsatisfactory as a description of a picture or a prose translation of a poem. Literary critics might fairly decline to exercise their judgment on the meagre skeleton of an artistic composition; but an orator who has overthrown and administered Governments becomes also amenable to political comment. A speech which has been received with enthusiastic applause illustrates the mental condition of the audience as well as the ability of their eloquent instructor. To an Englishman or an American accustomed to take elementary truisms for granted, it appears strange that it should be necessary in Spain to propound with didactic emphasis and fulness the simplest rudiments of political doctrine. That disorder and anarchy are incompatible with freedom is to the members of a settled and self-governing community, if not a self-evident truth, at least a part of established and undisputed tradition. It might have been supposed that Spaniards had learned by the practical experience of three or four generations that compulsory submission to force is the inevitable alternative of obedience to law. The elaborate despatch in which the FOREIGN MINISTER of Spain has lately proved that the Carlists are morally and logically in the wrong affords another illustration of the elementary nature of political controversy in Spain. In former years Señor CASTELAR taught his admiring disciples that laws and institutions of which they happened to disapprove were not sanctioned by any moral obligation. Republicans in Spain, as in France, refused to acknowledge the authority of majorities or of Governments when it clashed with the divine right of their favourite form of political organization. It is true that CASTELAR was always a sincere enthusiast, and not a selfish revolutionary disturber. An inveterate believer in fine phrases and benevolent sentiments, he selected as his teacher MAZZINI, who in his most exalted aspirations rejected the vulgar forms of Socialism and the bloodthirsty designs of modern Jacobins. There was perhaps some excuse for preferring a Republican Utopia to the condition of Spain under the licentious Court of ISABELLA, or under the control of a long succession of military adventurers and intriguing Parliamentary managers. CASTELAR and his friends resented the supremacy of the army before they had appreciated by practical ex-

perience the domination of the rabble. It is natural that a sanguine theorist roughly awakened from his illusions should desire to reconcile as far as possible his mature convictions with the remains of his former creed.

On some points the speech at Malaga may have sounded like a repudiation of Señor CASTELAR's earlier opinions, but the retraction was incidental and perhaps unconscious, while his main object was to assert and maintain his political consistency. One significant omission indeed may be accepted as a tacit confession of error. Federalism has perhaps finally disappeared from the Republican faith of which it had so oddly formed a part. The genuine Federalists of Spain, like the partisans of the Commune in France, desired to establish a cluster of petty Republics, in each of which clubs and demagogues should exercise absolute power untroubled by the interference of central Governments or of military force. The Spanish Federalists derived a colour for their doctrine from the historical fact that the monarchy had been formed by an amalgamation of petty kingdoms, and that it had absorbed and suppressed ancient municipal franchises. It would seem that CASTELAR and other well-meaning democrats supposed themselves to be Federalists only because the title had been appropriated by the extreme Republicans. As soon as the experiment of Federalism was tried, after the abdication of King AMADEO, it became impossible to tolerate the turbulence of Cadiz, Malaga, and Barcelona, or the traitorous secession of Carthagena. When a Republican Minister announced that he would never use force to coerce rebels who held his own political opinions, it became necessary to choose between the disruption of society and the abandonment of idle theories which now for the first time acquired a meaning. In his speech at Malaga Señor CASTELAR dwelt perhaps too long on his former determination to suppress at all hazards the ruinous insurrection of Carthagena. He abstained from reminding his hearers that the first step to the restoration of national unity was the suspension of the sittings of a factious Cortes nominally returned by universal suffrage. Government by one person is not the most perfect type of a Republic, but it was for the time necessary, and therefore justifiable. When CASTELAR professed himself a Federalist he had not thought that he should have to contend with Federalism at Carthagena. There was retributive justice in the destiny which compelled him to leave to his successor the final suppression of the rebellion. The disorganization of the army which he had strenuously promoted alone prevented him from reducing the insurgents to submission in a few weeks, even if they had dared to rise against a Government which could dispose of a regular and efficient force. But for the prolonged resistance of Carthagena the Carlists would perhaps have failed to organize a formidable civil war.

The arguments by which CASTELAR proves that a democratic Republic is the only admissible form of government are of a figurative and windy nature. The discoveries of science, the progress of industry, the mutual dependence of man on man, with a score of other commonplaces, are, it seems, the mysterious agents which make of modern society an inevitable democracy. The enumeration of the reasons for a Republic is neither more nor less convincing than one of the Count of CHAMBORD's periodical demonstrations that the welfare of France depends on the restoration of the White Flag and of the ancient dynasty. The progress of industry in its later or earlier stages requires a government, whether it is called a Monarchy or a Republic, which is able and willing to protect property, and if possible to leave trade alone. In some countries, including the United States and Switzerland, order and freedom are tolerably well protected by magistrates and Legislatures elected for a time. In England the same objects are not less effectually attained under an hereditary Chief of the State. Those who doubt whether a Republican form of government is well suited to Spain have a difficulty in conducting the controversy with Republican bigots whose opinions are wholly independent of expediency and of fact. A politician who would think it absurd to propose that Switzerland should become a kingdom may fairly assume that his scepticism as to a French or Spanish Republic is not a mere superstition. There is no similar presumption in favour of an enthusiast who believes in the Republic as a Spanish bishop or an English convert believes in the infallibility of the POPE. Faith claims to move in a higher sphere than reason, and consequently they cannot readily be compared. All the conditions of liberty which are correctly expounded by Señor CASTELAR were as fully secured, as far as laws

and constitutions could operate, under AMADEO as in the singular Republic which is administered by SERRANO. When the multitude at Malaga was advised to render the Republic orderly and stable, and to treat Monarchy as unquiet and revolutionary, it may perhaps have occurred to any dispassionate politician who might accidentally be present that it would have been equally easy and equally instructive to invert the suggested conditions of good government. As the Count of CHAMBORD would say, all good Frenchmen know that the Monarchy of St. LOUIS is orderly and stable, while the Republic has hitherto been unquiet and revolutionary. If a Republic possesses the supernatural attributes which are ascribed to it by its devotees, it ought to secure, or at least to promote, the public virtues which are, as CASTELAR rightly holds, indispensable to its success.

Political prophets, whether Republican or Legitimist, are at a disadvantage as compared with the religious zealots whom they strongly resemble. DRYDEN'S milk-white hind, or the Romish Church, of which she was the symbol, was immortal and unchanged:—

Without unspotted, innocent within,
She feared no danger, for she knew no sin.

The not less divine and immaculate Republic has, according to CASTELAR, incessant reason to fear danger, for "the first shot fired against order by a Republican would perhaps be the death wound of the Republic"; and "society placed between anarchy and dictatorship will always choose a dictator." A Church which seems, like that of Rome at the present time, to labour under adverse circumstances, may perhaps be nevertheless achieving an invisible triumph; but a Republic which is either suppressed or maintained in suspended vitality under MACMAHON or SERRANO can scarcely claim to be unchanged and immortal. No other political organization is in truth more sensitive or more perishable. A King or an Emperor who has suppressed resistance to his authority finds his prerogative strengthened and confirmed; but a Republic, or indeed a free government, finds it impossible to extend its full benefits to the rebels who assail its principle. The freest of all Governments is compelled from time to time to pass Coercion Acts for Ireland. After the close of the American Civil War the Southern States were for a time deprived of nearly all their constitutional rights. It is possible that when an orderly government is restored in Spain, it may bear the name of a Republic, but for a long time it must rest on force. The establishment of permanent Republics on the Continent of Europe is only made difficult because the most zealous Republicans are enemies of society. When a Republic was proclaimed in Spain in the spring of 1873, the extreme revolutionary faction at once seized for themselves the power which the more moderate professors of the same nominal faith had hoped to secure. When the nation recoiled in disgust from anarchy, CASTELAR made the Republic tolerable by administering it as an absolute monarchy; and his successors have continued the same provisional substitute for a regular form of government. That a system which was found intolerable on a six months' trial is indispensable, sacred, and perpetual, is a proposition which requires more than eloquent declamation to prove it.

DROUGHT IN ENGLAND.

WATER Companies and water rates have pretty well banished the old-fashioned notion that air and water were almost equally plentiful. If the progress of civilization continues to be as rapid and unsavoury as it has hitherto shown itself, even fresh air may come to be laid on at so much a quarter; but at present the difference between the supply of the two commodities is very marked. There are many parts of the country in which water is only to be had with difficulty, while pure water is not to be had at all. Several causes have contributed to this alarming result. Improved systems of drainage have dried up the wells and emptied the pools which used in many districts to serve as natural tanks. The soil which once was a sponge has been converted into a sieve. Instead of retaining the winter rains until they are slowly dried up by the summer's sun, it sends them on at once to the nearest watercourse. The rivers themselves suffer under this treatment. They overflow in wet seasons, and are almost empty after a long drought. Even if they were as full as ever, the quality of the water is such that an abundance of it would be only a

doubtful benefit. Modern drainage not only subtracts moisture, it adds solid matters of a highly mischievous kind. Sewage and the washings of manufactories are a very common but a very unsatisfactory drink. Wells in porous soils share the same disadvantage. The poison that finds its way into the earth passes through it too rapidly to lose its pernicious properties, and the springs that it contaminates make the best possible medium for communicating any infection with which it may be charged. Thus, of the three natural sources of drinking water, two, rivers and wells, are so fouled as to make them in many cases actively injurious to health, while the third, rain-water, is recklessly allowed to run to waste. We should expect in this state of things to hear of much suffering and much preventable disease; and what little information there is on the subject points in the same direction. Warning voices are raised from time to time of the inevitable famine of water that must follow upon the next prolonged drought. This summer we have heard of farmers being obliged to send their teams fifteen miles in search of water, and of children crying for thirst which their parents cannot relieve without going a long distance or paying money which they can ill spare. The reports of the inspections which are instituted by the Local Government Board on the occasion of the outbreak of any epidemic almost invariably return polluted water as one of the causes, if not the sole cause, of the disease. These are only chance examples which present themselves without being looked for, but it is easy to divine from them what would be the result of a detailed and systematic inquiry into the water supply. It is not every village that has a Correspondent of the *Times* living in it. There are many cases in which the causes of disease are all present without disease actually showing itself, and it is only in the latter event that any investigation is instituted. Probably there is hardly a village in England in which many of the wells are not poisoned, and in the drier parts of the country hardly a village in which, during some part at least of the year, water is not inconveniently scarce.

It needs no argument to show how formidable a state of things this is. It has been proved by experience that no vehicle of disease is so fatal as drinking-water. If water were always pure, cholera would be almost banished, and the risk of typhoid fever reduced by more than one-half. And though it is known what harm bad water can do in cases of infectious disease, no one can accurately estimate the extent to which other complaints come from the same cause, or how far its effects may be traced in a condition of general ill-health almost as mischievous in the long run as acute disease. The evils that follow from scarcity of water, though less obvious perhaps, are not less serious. Where there is a difficulty in getting water to drink there can be no question of washing, and when dirt is accepted as a permanent necessity, there must in a majority of cases be ill-health and loss of self-respect. Again, though there may be a difficulty in getting water to drink, there is never any difficulty in getting something else. The first requisite to sobriety is to have the means of satisfying thirst without going to the public-house. When water is scarce or bad it becomes a mockery to preach temperance. Men are prone enough to drink to excess when they have only their taste to please; what must be their temptation when they have a natural want to satisfy, and can only satisfy it by beer? All the efforts of philanthropists and moralists must be of little avail so long as dirt and drunkenness are unavoidable; and without abundance of water it is hard to see how either can be prevented. It would be difficult, therefore, to exaggerate the importance of this question of water supply as regards its personal aspect; and besides this, there is its agricultural aspect to be considered. Farmers who have to send their horses many miles for water are at an immense disadvantage as compared with farmers who have all they want close at hand. A horse can but do a certain amount of work in a day, and if for some hours he has to be thus employed, he cannot be employed in other and more profitable ways. Besides the waste of labour entailed by having to bring water from a distance, considerable injury to the more delicate crops and to stock is involved in not having a plentiful supply of it always ready. In very dry seasons many parts of England reproduce on a small scale some of the phenomena of a drought in India. There is no food for the cattle, and they have to be killed off and sold for what they will fetch to avoid the alternative of seeing them die and fetch nothing.

The question of water supply calls for much more careful attention than has yet been bestowed upon it. Some useful suggestions will no doubt be made by the Royal Commission on the pollution of rivers which has now brought its labours to an end. But rivers after all are only a small part of the whole subject. It is not merely the causes which lead to rivers being foul that need looking into; the causes which lead to their being empty have an equal claim on public attention. Again, but a small part of the drinking-water of the population is drawn from rivers. Wells and springs of all kinds are in this respect of even greater importance. The questions how far drainage has diminished the amount of water supplied through these channels, and how far it has affected the wholesomeness of what is supplied, have not been dealt with, though they must affect at least as many persons as the questions included in the Commissioners' instructions. If the two charges of deficiency and impurity can be made good against the water obtained from wells—and in many instances there is every reason to believe that they can be made good—there is the further question to be considered what sources of supply can be substituted for wells. One expedient is to extend the system at present in use in most towns to larger areas. There are still districts in which the supply of water is unfailing and enormously in excess of local requirements. Indeed it would be more accurate to say that no local requirements exist. From the lakes of Wales or Cumberland, or from reservoirs constructed among their mountains, water might be conducted to all parts of England. The expense of this system will probably stand in the way of its adoption except in the case of great cities, although under an improved system of local administration the force of this objection might be lessened. A less ambitious design might embrace the storage and utilization of the surplus waters of each district. Even in places where water is scarcest it may often be running to waste a few miles off. The evil of modern drainage is that it carries water too quickly into the nearest river and thence into the sea, and, if the current could be intercepted, reservoirs might gain what wells lose. The simplest and perhaps the most effectual expedient of all would be the storage of rain-water. In this climate the winter rains might furnish water enough for the whole year if they could only be laid up till they were wanted, and there is nothing in the problem how to do this that would be beyond the skill of a competent civil engineer. But before any of these remedies can be applied on a scale sufficient to meet the need, the extent and character of the existing water supply must be accurately known. It is not defective everywhere or impure everywhere. In some places it is both; in others it is on the eve of becoming both; in others it is perfectly satisfactory; in others nothing but a little rearrangement is wanted to make it so. The Local Government Board may have the means of arriving at this knowledge through their own officers, and when once it has been obtained, they can call in the best engineering authorities to determine what measures must be taken to ensure an adequate supply of wholesome water in every part of the country. If the inquiry is too extensive to be undertaken by a Government department which already has its hands full, the proper instrument for the purpose would be a Royal Commission. The Commissioners who have lately been investigating the kindred subject of the pollution of rivers might have their powers renewed and extended for this purpose.

EDUCATIONAL COMPROMISES.

IN the last of the chapters on Compromise which Mr. JOHN MORLEY has been writing in the *Fortnightly Review*, the Education Act of 1870 is quoted as an example of what compromise ought not to be. It was not only, says Mr. MORLEY, a small reform, but it was a small reform made on lines and in a direction antagonistic to those of the great reform which must ultimately follow it. "It was clearly agreed among the Government and the whole of the party at their backs that at some time or other, near or remote, if public instruction was to be made genuinely effective, the private, voluntary, or denominational system would have to be replaced by a national system. To prepare for this ultimate replacement was one of the points to be most steadily borne in mind, however slowly and tentatively the process might be conducted. Instead of that, the author of the Act de-

liberately introduced provisions for extending and "strengthening the very system which will have eventually "to be superseded." It is something to get hold of a charge against the Act which really goes to the bottom of the matter. There is no doubt whatever that the effect of the provision about new building grants was what Mr. MORLEY describes it to be, a deliberate extension and strengthening of the voluntary system. It may also be admitted that the introduction of a national system was the introduction of a power which will probably some day absorb the voluntary system. But, though we may accept Mr. MORLEY's account of the facts, we cannot accept what he considers to be the identical statement, that by this small reform the author of the Act made the future great reform the more difficult of achievement. On the contrary, we hold that the manner in which the introduction of a national system was combined with the extension of the voluntary system, which it may very likely one day replace, will make this eventual replacement easier, while it tends to raise the standard of education in the interval. As regards the first position, it must be borne in mind that the provision about building grants did to a very great degree disarm the advocates of voluntary schools. Mr. FORSTER had declared that he had no enmity to voluntary schools, but it is doubtful how far he would have been believed if he had not given this indisputable proof of his good will towards them. It may be objected that it was not necessary to disarm the supporters of voluntary schools, since the Government majority was large enough to carry the Education Bill against any amount of Conservative opposition. This view underrates the number of allies which on this question the Conservative Opposition would have found on the Liberal benches. The supporters of voluntary schools in the House of Commons were not all opponents of the Government. Many of them were men who habitually voted with the Government; and if they had for once voted against the Government, the Liberal majority might have dwindled away to nothing. But, setting this aside, the successful working of the Bill depended in a great degree upon the temper in which it was received in the country. If the supporters of voluntary schools had everywhere opposed the formation of School Boards, and had refused to be elected on them where their formation was inevitable, a great deal of educational energy and educational experience would have been lost to the national system. The School Boards, instead of being worked in accord with the voluntarists, would generally have been animated by active hatred of them. The influence of this feeling would have been seen in their educational policy; and, since the moderate element in the constituencies would have been in a great measure unrepresented, owing to the refusal of voluntarists to offer themselves as candidates, there would probably have been a good many reproductions of the Birmingham School Board. Under these circumstances the Conservative reaction would have been as conspicuous in the region of elementary education as it has been with regard to Endowed Schools. The first Bill introduced by the new Ministry would have been a Bill to modify the Act of 1870, and if the time between 1870 and 1874 had been spent in fierce contests between the advocates of School Boards and the advocates of voluntary schools, it is probable that the legislation of the present Session would have placed the former in a far more disadvantageous position than that which they hold under the Act.

It may be objected that the voluntarists might have been propitiated by a smaller concession than the liberty to build new schools with public money for a specified time. The answer to this is found in the fact that this particular concession has another merit, that of improving the standard of elementary education for the present. As yet we have hardly made acquaintance with the kind of schools that will be maintained by School Boards which have been formed against the will of the ratepayers, and whose members represent for the most part a dogged conviction that children are better without education than with it. School Boards of this type will soon be common throughout the country. Not a week passes that orders for their compulsory formation do not go out from the Education Department. The parishes to which these orders apply have usually had no mind to supply their educational deficiencies. If they had any desire to do so they would have formed a School Board as soon as their want of school accommodation was communicated to them, and not waited till they were forced to form them. A School Board elected under the influence of this temper is

not likely to display any zeal in the cause of education. By and by, as the parents come to feel interested in their children's advancement, things may be different, but as yet the question is likely to be treated simply as it affects the rates. The main object which the School Board will propose to itself will be to spend as little money as possible. A national school conducted on this principle will be inferior as an educational instrument to a voluntary school which has been founded perhaps to keep out a School Board, and which will be constantly in fear of having one created if the educational wants of the parish are not properly supplied. In a great many districts the choice lay between putting the school into the hands of the parson or into the hands of the farmers. The result of the extension of the time within which building grants could be applied for was no doubt in many cases to put the school into the hands of the parson; but we believe that for some years to come the interests of education will be better served by this course than by the opposite one. A good voluntary school is better than a bad school which calls itself national; and if Mr. FORSTER sacrificed consistency by increasing the number of voluntary schools at the same time that he was providing for the creation of other schools wherever voluntary schools were wanting, he sacrificed it in the interests of the children who have to be instructed.

Nor do we admit that in taking this course Mr. FORSTER can be fairly charged with forgetting that at some time or other the voluntary system will in all probability have to be replaced by a national system. That replacement will only be effected with the good will of the voluntary schools, and the less enmity there is between the friends of the two systems at starting the more likely will the voluntarists be to make over their schools to the public authorities. When once a national system is set on foot—and it is set on foot in principle as soon as the State undertakes to supply all deficiencies that may be detected in the provision of voluntary schools—the managers of every voluntary school will know that when they give secular instruction to the children, they give at considerable cost to themselves what the State would give equally well if the voluntary school were closed. This is a reflection which, as the flames of controversy die away, must naturally affect in a highly unfavourable manner the zeal and liberality of the supporters of voluntary schools. It is one thing to spend time and money in having children taught to read, write, and cipher when without this expenditure they would not be taught at all, and it is another thing to spend time and money for this purpose when without this expenditure the children would be taught equally well at the cost of the community. For some time to come no doubt the supporters of voluntary schools will assure themselves that children can only be taught religion by the same person who gives them secular instruction. But this assurance will at last be sapped by the discovery that other voluntary schools have been made over to School Boards on terms which allow of the children getting as much and as good religious instruction in other ways. When this discovery has once been made, the clergy will wonder that they could ever have burdened themselves with the provision of secular instruction when it was so much easier to leave that to be provided by some one else and to concern themselves solely with the provision of religious instruction. The building of new voluntary schools therefore was only the building of schools which are destined, if this anticipation proves correct, to become national schools at some future time, not by virtue of a triumph of one system over another, but by the gradual withdrawal of the voluntarists from a work in which they will have ceased to take any special interest. The replacement of the voluntary system by a national system would not have been really forwarded by a measure which made it a point of honour with the supporters of voluntary schools to carry on their present rivalry with School Boards, and any less conciliatory Act than that of 1870 would probably have had this effect.

WEAK POINTS IN COMPETITIVE EXAMINATION.

THE current number of *Macmillan's Magazine* contains a contribution to a very important controversy which may be worth notice. Mr. Scoones has written a paper upon the mode of appointment to the Civil Service of India, at the invitation, as he tells us, and "under cover of the moral support of some Headmasters of leading public schools." The paper is moderate and

sensible, and is founded upon a very intimate knowledge of the facts. If we were disposed to be critical, we might complain that we are here and there left rather in the dark as to the precise drift of Mr. Scoones's argument; but we must not be too hard upon a specimen of English composition which is patronized by the Headmasters of public schools. His general meaning is abundantly plain; and he makes a very definite proposal on which we shall presently offer a few remarks.

The first part, however, of the paper is occupied with an attack upon certain details in the existing arrangements; and we take Mr. Scoones to infer that the alteration of these details would remove the most serious objections to the competitive system. He complains, for example, of the well-meant device by which a certain number of marks is deducted from the total in every subject. The purpose of this regulation was of course to hinder candidates from attacking a large number of subjects in the hope that even a smattering of information upon each would catch a few marks. Mr. Scoones says that the system works very unfairly. If, for example, a candidate gains 625—that is, half—marks out of the 1,250 assigned to mathematics, 125 marks are deducted from his total, and he therefore counts 500 marks. If he gets half the marks, or 187, in each of three modern languages in each of which the full marks would be 375, 125 marks are deducted from his score in each of the three. Thus 375 has to be deducted from his total of 561 marks, or he counts only 186. Therefore, says Mr. Scoones, if we assume that a fair knowledge of the language, literature, and history of the three countries should be equivalent to a fair knowledge of mathematics, a gross injustice is done. The total marks apparently assigned in the one case are 1,250, and in the other 1,135; and yet of two candidates who get half marks in each, one is allowed 500 and the other only 186. We find it very difficult to judge of this argument. In the first place, we really cannot say whether a knowledge of three languages ought, or ought not, to be equal to a knowledge of mathematics; in the next place, we cannot say whether it is as easy to get half marks in the mathematical examination as to get half marks in the literary examination; and, further, we do not see why any wrong could not be remedied by altering the total marks assigned as easily as by altering the system of deduction. It is surely a fallacy to argue that the value of two different departments of knowledge is assumed to be equal because the total marks assigned to them are approximately equal; and then to show that the system of marking, when rightly understood, proves that the examiners do not value the two kinds of knowledge equally. The candidates know the conditions beforehand; and all that clearly results is, that knowledge spread over three subjects pays less than knowledge concentrated upon one. This was precisely the object of the regulations. Mr. Scoones, however, tells us that for some reason, which he does not explain, the object has not been secured. As a matter of fact, candidates scatter their efforts very widely; and, for example, only 53 out of 1,170 candidates in five years confined themselves to two branches of knowledge. As Mr. Scoones does not help us to understand this result, we shall not attempt any conjecture for ourselves. In fact, it would be impossible here to go into the minute considerations which would be necessary for judging of the working of the plan, and which require for their appreciation an intimate knowledge of the facts.

Mr. Scoones's opinion doubtless deserves attention; but we must leave the discussion to experts, with a single remark. The plan of deducting marks is certainly a rough and mechanical expedient. It is an attempt to lay down a hard and fast line to force examiners to do their duty. A skilful examiner could sufficiently discourage superficial knowledge without any such self-acting apparatus. An examiner may, if he chooses, set a paper in mathematics which should prevent a senior wrangler from getting twice as many marks as the "wooden spoon," or should enable him to get a thousand or ten thousand times as many. The scale by which men's talents are measured may be so arranged as to separate the best candidates as widely as possible from the worst, or so as to distinguish most accurately between the bad and the very bad, and give only a slight advantage to the really good. Different systems may be useful in different cases; but in any case questions may be asked in such a way as entirely to neutralize or greatly to intensify the effect of the deduction system. It is therefore much more important to know how the examiners discharge their duties in practice than to know what are the official rules. And we are sorry to see that Mr. Scoones makes the very serious complaint against most of the examiners that their standard is altogether fluctuating and arbitrary. In one year we are told that only one candidate got over 500 marks in mathematics, only 3 over 400, and 14 over 250; whilst 37 did not qualify. In the next year 15 got over 500, 26 over 400, 44 over 250, and only 15 did not qualify. We can easily understand that such fluctuations, which must be due to variations in the examiners rather than in the merit of the candidates, must make the whole system uncertain; and Mr. Scoones gives some striking instances to show how poor candidates have been seduced into taking up some study by the leniency of the examiners of one year, and found that their labours were entirely misguided owing to the severity of their successors in the next. The great virtue of an examination is an approach to fixity in the standard of merit; and Mr. Scoones has certainly shown cause for complaining of some of the results hitherto obtained. Incidentally, too, he gives a rather unpleasant picture of the system generally. Admitting the force of his protest against the sweeping accusations against crammers, we cannot say that his revelations suggest that

they would in any case supply a very healthy system of education. It is "quite intolerable," he says, to listen to the "ever-recurring question," "Do you think such and such a subject will pay this year?" His moral is apparently that there should be more certainty as to what will pay. We should be inclined to add that an education which consists entirely in devoting years of labour to studying subjects which "pay," irrespectively of any more intelligent motive, is a radically bad one. Even if the standard were made as invariable as possible, a young man who works for four or five of the most precious years of his life exclusively with a view to getting marks, and whose teacher encourages him to work exclusively for results, is under a very unhealthy intellectual stimulus, though the name of "cram" may imply a distorted view of its evils. However skilfully the examination test may be manipulated, it is always liable to this grave objection of narrowing and lowering the whole aim of education; and though it may be difficult to suggest any practicable alternative, we are not surprised that such a system of appointment leads to very serious evils.

Mr. Scoones recognizes such evils, and has a plan for meeting them practically. He admits that there are other qualities besides mere skill in passing examinations which should fit a man for taking part in the government of a great empire. He proposes, therefore, a scheme which should allow of their being tested. Instead of selecting the candidates absolutely by the result of the examination, he would take the 65 or 70 best candidates for the 40 annual vacancies. These probationers should be brought together in a college for a year. At that time a competent staff of adjudicators should select the 40 most suitable for final appointment, and give some rewards, such as appointments to the Engineering College, to three-fourths of the remainder. The plan is, of course, a very rough one, and Mr. Scoones admits the difficulty of forming a satisfactory board of judges. Supposing that these difficulties can be surmounted, we agree that the plan recognizes one great evil of the present system. It was doubtless a mistake to abolish Haileybury. The system of open competition might have been applied as freely if the entrance to Haileybury had been thrown open as by the present arrangement. As it is, young men are left for two years after their first examination to pick up knowledge as they please, subject only to their being continually harassed by examinations. The advantage of bringing them together under a tolerable system of training, and encouraging that *esprit de corps* which is naturally stimulated amongst fellow-students, is generally admitted now that it has been lost. But when we have admitted that Mr. Scoones's plan recognizes these considerations, we must add that it seems to be very doubtful in some other respects. The main objection is abundantly obvious, and is tacitly recognized by Mr. Scoones. On the present plan, a successful candidate has at least gained a certain appointment. On Mr. Scoones's plan he would only gain the chance of receiving an appointment. He would become a probationer, and the chances of his being finally successful would be only as 4 to 3 or 2½. It is plain that this would very much diminish the attractions of the appointments. The youth who had become a probationer and failed of final success would have suffered a positive injury. Till the age of perhaps two or three-and-twenty he would have been preparing himself for a special profession, and would then be turned loose upon the world with much of his labour thrown away. At present a candidate who fails in his examination has plenty of time to take to something else. Under the proposed plan the time spent at the college would be to a great extent wasted for any other purpose; and a year sounds a long time to a young man, as it gives a distinct start to his contemporaries who have pursued the direct course through the Universities to other professions. So far, therefore, as the plan is effective it will clearly tend to frighten away some of the youths who are now attracted; nor do we suppose that by substituting for some of the successful candidates a selection from the twenty or thirty below them on the list any great improvement would be made in the material. Mr. Scoones, as we have said, seems to recognize this difficulty, and he meets it in two ways. He limits the residence in the proposed college to a year, which we fear would decidedly injure its efficiency, both because the time for special study would be short, and because a college in which each year is entirely distinct from its successors and predecessors would have but a faint corporate vitality. And he proposes to give some sort of consolation prizes to most of the unsuccessful. This last scheme would, of course, soften the blow; but we doubt whether it would be very agreeable. The youth whose ambition pointed to the Civil Service would very probably not care to become an Engineer, and perhaps the Engineers would not welcome the addition to their ranks of the failures of the Civil Service. Without going into details, however, the proposal strikes us more as a recognition of a weak point in the scheme than as offering an efficient remedy. Like other compromises between two principles, this attempt to reconcile the scheme of appointment by competitive examination and appointment by skilled and impartial judges is more ingenious than satisfactory. Still it may suggest a ground for future discussion, and stimulate the increasing conviction that we have not as yet hit upon an ideally perfect arrangement.

DEVIZES.

THE name of the town of Devizes at once strikes the ear as something which does not readily fall under any of the classes into which English place-names commonly fall. It is not a Roman

or British name which has lived through the English Conquest. Nor is it an English name either describing the place or preserving the memory of a tribe or of an early owner. Nor yet is it, like Beaulieu and Richmond, a name palpably French, witnessing to the days when Norman and other foreign settlers had made French the polite speech of the land. The name is Latin without being Roman. For once the Latin name is not made from the English, but the English from the Latin. The castle "ad Divisas" has become Devizes, or rather "the Devizes." The article was used as late as Clarendon and, we fancy, much later; the popular local name of the place is "the Vize." It is plainly called from a boundary or division of some kind, but what boundary or division is not at first sight very clear. It must be remembered that the name "Divise" is not found till the foundation of the castle by Bishop Roger of Salisbury in the time of Henry the First, of which more anon. The town is one of the same class as Richmond, one which has arisen around a castle of comparatively late foundation. Why then did Bishop Roger give his fortress so odd a name? Dr. Guest points out that the town of Devizes overlooks the Avon valley, that it stands just on the border of that narrow slip of territory which the Britons kept after the victories of Ceawlin up to the battle of Bradford in 652. He holds that the march district was called "Divise," and that the castle took its name from the district. He refers to the town of Mere in the same county, a good deal south-west of Devizes, where the name, an English equivalent, as he remarks, of Divise, is clearly derived from the border position of the place. It is very seldom, and always with great diffidence, that we set up our judgment against that of Dr. Guest, but this is a case in which we are strongly tempted to do so. Mere is an English word, and the name may be as old as the first English occupation of the district. Divise is a Latin word, and Dr. Guest does not bring any instance of the name being used before Bishop Roger's time. It would certainly be strange if a district had, for five hundred years, kept a Latin name of which no trace can be found. It certainly seems to us more likely that the "divise" from which the castle took its name were some smaller local boundary, and we believe that local antiquaries are ready with more than one explanation of this kind. And as for the oddness of the name, it must be remembered that it is not a name which arises from any settlement or tradition, but from the fancy of one man. In such cases eccentric names have often been given in all ages.

Another question may arise whether the place had any being at all before the foundation of the famous castle. Most of the great Norman castles were reared on earlier sites; the mound and the ditch, as we have been taught by Mr. Clark, are for the most part English works—works most commonly of Edward the Elder or of his sister the Lady of the Mercians. But their works are placed along the line of defence against the Danes, and they are found in places which bear intelligible names, whether of English or earlier origin. One hardly sees why they should fortify a post in the heart of Wessex, and, if they did, the place would bear some name, and it is not likely that that name would be Divise. But, whether the earthworks belong to an earlier time or not, it is certain that the vast fosse, the mighty mound which the unseen railway now passes under, was first crowned by a castle in the later sense by Bishop Roger. Certainly no place brings more strongly home to us the temporal position of a Bishop in those days. The episcopal castle and the episcopal palace are two very different things. The palace, in strictness of speech, is the Bishop's dwelling in the episcopal city. It is only a piece of modern affectation which, since both the English Metropolitans have forsaken their natural homes, speaks of the manors of Lambeth and Bishopthorpe as palaces. The episcopal palace, hard by the episcopal church, sometimes actually joining it, is for the most part in strictness a house. Standing, in many cases, within a walled town, it needed no great amount of defence, and even when, as at Wells, some degree of fortification was needed, it was plainly no more than was needed for protection in case of danger. Castles in the strict sense in the episcopal city, castles like those of Durham and Llandaff, are quite exceptional, though they may be easily explained by the circumstances and history of the places where they are found. At Durham Bishop Walcher was placed by William as both temporal and spiritual ruler among a fierce and half-conquered people, who had slain two former earls, and who were in the end to slay the Bishop himself. It is not wonderful that he was placed in a fortress even within the episcopal city. At Llandaff a Bishop placed among the turbulent Welsh, and whose city was a mere unwallled village, needed a fortress no less than his more princely brother of Durham. Wolvesley, the castle of the Bishops of Winchester, not actually within the city, but just outside of it, was more remarkable and unusual. But in episcopal dwellings away from the cities, the castle is, in the days with which we are dealing, the rule. The Bishop of the first century or so after the Norman Conquest, turned by the Norman polity into a military tenant of the Crown, dwelling commonly as a stranger among strange and often hostile people, raised most likely to his see as the reward of temporal services to the Crown, as soon as he got away from the episcopal city and its more peaceful associations, as soon as he found himself on his rural estates, began to feel like any other baron on his rural estates. He raised for himself, not a house, not a palace, but a castle in the strictest sense; a fortress not merely capable of defence in case of any sudden attack, but capable of being made a centre of military operations in case the Bishop should take a fancy, in times of civil strife, to make war upon some other baron

or upon the King himself. And Roger of Salisbury was not likely to be behind his brethren in this matter. The poor clerk who had taken the fancy of the Ætheling Henry by the speed with which he gabbled over the service in his lowly church in a suburb of Caen, and who was thereon declared to be the fittest of all chaplains for soldiers, had risen with the fortunes of his patron, and, as the chief minister of the Lion of Justice, he was the most powerful man in the realm. Architecture, both military and ecclesiastical, was a special taste of his, and it would seem from the description of his works given by William of Malmesbury that the later form of the Norman style, the form where a finer masonry and more elaborate kind of ornament came into use, was in some measure his creation. As Bishop of Salisbury—that is, not of the new Salisbury in the plain, but of that elder Salisbury where the city itself was the mightiest of fortresses, but where the Bishop was not the sole lord of the city—Roger was not unnaturally stirred up to the raising of fortresses on the episcopal estates which might be wholly his own. At Malmesbury he gave great offence to the monks by building a castle within the very precincts of their monastery. At Sherborne, the town which his last predecessor but one, the Lotharingian Hermann, had forsaken for the old British hill-fort, he built another castle; but, unlike Malmesbury, quite distinct, and at some distance from the minster. But his great work was at the Devises; the huge earthwork, whether he threw it up himself or found it there already, was crowned with a castle which was said not to be surpassed by any castle in Europe. Its fragments show that it must have been an example of a rich form of the style of which its founder was such a master, a form intermediate between the stern simplicity of the days of the Conqueror and the lavish gorgeousness of the days of Henry the Second. But unluckily all that is now to be seen consists of mere fragments here and there, fragments for the most part built up again as meaningless ornaments in the midst of the most fearful piece of modern gimcrack that human eyes ever beheld. But the mound and the ditch at least are there. It would need more than another Roger to get rid of them, and we can without much difficulty call up before our eyes that remarkable episode in the most troubled time of our history of which the castle of the Devises was the scene.

The sudden imprisonment of Bishop Roger by command of Stephen seems to have been the turning point of his reign. It at once set the clergy against him, and it seems besides this to have awakened general wonder as something so unlike the general character of the King. He who was held to be, in the words of the Chroniclers, a "mild man and soft and good, and who did no injustice," suddenly turns about, and, without any very clear reason, seizes in the most ignominious way on two of the chief men both in Church and State. People were struck both with the act in itself and with its strangeness in a man like Stephen, who, whatever were his faults, is not at any other time charged with cruelty, or even with lack of generosity, in his own person. But the moral difficulty is perhaps not very great. A man like Stephen, mild and gentle rather than temper than from principle, would, if he were once stirred up to what he was told to be an act of energy, be most likely to overdo matters, and to be energetic at the wrong time and in the wrong way. Anyhow, here was the great Bishop Roger, the most powerful man in England, the minister of the late King, suddenly seized along with his nephew Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, and his avowed son Roger the King's Chancellor, during the sitting of a great Council at Oxford, and threatened with all manner of threats, unless all the castles and their possessions were surrendered to the King. But our concern is only with the one castle which was Roger's great work. Another nephew, Richard Bishop of Ely, managed to escape to his uncle's fortress, "ad Divisas fortissimum oppidum," where the chief tower ("principalis munitio") was held by the younger Roger's mother, Matilda of Ramsbury, who was likely enough the Bishop of Salisbury's unacknowledged wife. The King comes before the castle, on the site doubtless of the present approach from the town, swearing in his wrath that the younger Roger shall be hanged and the elder kept without food unless the castle is at once surrendered. Another version indeed makes it a voluntary offer on the part of the Bishop of Salisbury, in the hope of making his nephew yield, that he will not eat or drink till the castle is given up. In either case we have the picture of the mild Stephen suddenly turned as fierce as William Rufus, with his three prisoners, the two Bishops and the Chancellor, the Bishops just released, it would seem, from their wretched imprisonment, one in an ox's stall, the other in some miserable shed not otherwise defined. There is the great Bishop Roger, suddenly fallen from his pomp and power, standing faint and hungry before the walls, allowed to make the attempt by the sad sight and by his sad words to move his obstinate nephew the Bishop of Ely to surrender, if only to save the life of his uncle. We see the pair on the walls, the Bishop of Ely unmoved by his uncle's pleading and ready to let him or anybody else starve rather than give up the stronghold within which he has found shelter. Then the King is moved to further wrath; a gibbet is set up, the Chancellor is to be hanged at once. But his mother holds the strongest tower, her heart is moved for her son, if the Bishop's heart is not moved for his uncle; she will give up anything for her child. The great tower is at once surrendered, and after that the resistance of the Bishop of Ely and his followers is all in vain. We read the story, we go to the spot, and try to call up the scene. If the castle stood there untouched, it would be easy; if nothing stood there at all, it would not be very hard; but when the castle of Bishop Roger is turned into a grotesque modern mockery, what is to be done?

Some comfort, however, may be drawn from a visit to the two churches of the town. They have not fared worse than churches commonly do in the space of seven hundred years. They have at least not been deliberately and of malice aforethought turned into shams. There are not many towns in England which still keep two vaulted Norman choirs, one of which is not unlikely to be the work of Roger himself.

MEDIEVAL PROJECTORS.

WHEN Chaucer's pilgrims had reached the old village of Broughton under the Forest of Blean, within six miles of Canterbury, and about a mile to the south of the present high road, they were overtaken by a man clothed in black with a white surplice underneath, his cloak sewed to his hood, his hat fastened by a lace hanging down his back, and a saddle-bag, which contained his scanty clothing, thrown across the crupper. After long looking, Chaucer perceived that he was a Canon accompanied by his Yeoman, or servant. In the morning they had seen the company ride forth from their inn, and had spurred forward to overtake them. The dapple grey horse of the master sweated so that it was wonderful to see; while the servant's, flecked with foam like a pye, was well nigh foundered. The Yeoman, full of courtesy, fell into conversation with Harry Bailly, the host and guide of the pilgrims, and began to praise the Canon his master, saying that, homely as he rode among them, he was a passing man, and could, if he would, pave all the way to Canterbury with silver and gold. "Bless us!" said the host, "if he be a man of such worship, why does he care so little for his dignity as to ride in those dirty, ragged old overalls not worth a mite; if he can buy better cloth, why goes he so sluttish?" "Well," replied the Yeoman, "it fares with my lord as with other men of over-great wit—he misuses it." In answer to further questions he went on to confess that, master and man, they dwelt together among thieves in holes and corners, for ever poring over the fire to multiply gold, always hoping and always failing, groping after the science which fled far before them and would, at last, lure them on to beggary. The Canon, suspecting that his servant was speaking of him, drew nigh and bade him hold his peace, for he was discovering what should remain hidden. The host encouraged the Yeoman to tell on, and not care for his master's threats. "I care for them but little," said he, and when the Canon saw that all his secrets would be disclosed, he fled away for very shame; and the Yeoman proceeded to lay open the lives of two professors of alchemy—one, his master, who duped himself as well as his neighbours, the other, a false Judas of a Canon, who was a mere cheat.

The introduction of the Canon's Yeoman, when several of the pilgrims had not yet told their tales, seemed so extraordinary to Tyrwhitt that he supposed some sudden resentment had moved Chaucer to break the order of his work in order to insert a satire against alchemists. If it were so, it was a lucky accident; but was it not rather one of the purposed interruptions, and the happiest of them all, by which he has given reality and life to the journey? The earnest protestation that his master was not the treacherous Judas for whose cursedness the Yeoman would have blushed if everlasting blowing of a hot fire and the fume of mercury had not consumed his redness, the unmeasured invective which breaks forth throughout the tale, and the fear lest it should be taken as directed against all professors of alchemy, indicate that Chaucer was not unacquainted with alchemists, and was full of bitterness against some one of them. However that may be, the prologue and the tale prove the strong sense which preserved him from the delusion of the philosophers of his time, and of times long after him, and how well he understood the character of a class of men—the projectors—whom Dean Swift feared, hated, and ridiculed. Tyrwhitt has mentioned two instances of the general belief, in that age, of the art of transmuting metals. The rose nobles of Edward III. in the year 1343 were supposed to have been coined from gold made by Raymond Lully in the Tower, and in the year 1404 it became felony, by statute, to multiply gold or silver. As late as the year 1618, Sir Giles Mompesson, Massinger's Sir Giles Overreach, and Francis Michel, a poor, sneaking justice of Clerkenwell, the Justice Greedy of the *New Way to Pay Old Debts*, had found out a new "alchymistical" way to make gold and silver lace with copper. They sued for a patent which Lord Bacon, then Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice of England, and the Attorney-General certified to be fit and convenient, and that it would redound to the King's profit at least 10,000*l.* a year. In the space of nearly one hundred years, excepting a Latin translation of two books of *Troilus and Creseide*, three of the *Canterbury Tales* were the only works of Chaucer published. Of these the "Canon's Yeoman's Tale," printed in 1652, was one, and may have borne its part, with Ben Jonson's admirable comedy, in dispelling the illusions of the students of alchemy, and turning men from the alchymistical way of making gold and silver out of copper.

A more remarkable instance of the prevalent belief in alchemy in the fourteenth century is to be found in Rymer. In the year 1329 Edward III. sent writs to the sheriffs stating that John le Rous and Master William de Dalby, by the art of alchemy, knew how to make, and had made, and were making silver; and because by making that metal, if really it could be made, much profit might come to the King and to the kingdom, Thomas Cary had been appointed to bring them up safely to the King, together with the instruments used in their art, conducting them honourably if they would come; if not, using force. Gower believed in alchemy, or, as he calls it, "alconomie." He had no faith in modern pro-

fessors of the art, and exhorted them to renounce it as sure to bring ruin upon them; but that the science in itself was true he affirmed confidently:—

To get a pounce thei spenden five,
I not how such a crafte shall thrive.
In the maner as it is used
It were better be refused
Than for to worchen upon wene,
In thyng whiche stant not as thei wene;
But not for thy who that it knewe,
The science of hymselfe is trewe.

And he goes on to say that the elixir was grounded upon nature, but modern alchemists could not discover it by reason of their ignorance. Chaucer had no such faith in the truth of the science. After telling with much humour, by the mouth of the Yeoman, the doctrine of the alchemists and their practice—how they blew the fire until their hearts fainted, and inhaled the fumes of quicksilver until they were of the hue of lead; the sordid misery, the threadbare array, the ill savour, infecting the passenger a mile off, of the sincere professors; their hope for ever deferred, and the madness which impelled them to waste on that cursed craft all their goods to the last sheet and mantle—he proceeds to describe a Judas among canons, an unbeliever who pretended to be sincere in order to cozen his fellows. He entreats those who use the art to renounce it before they purchase the curses of the folk whom they beguile. Then, still in the character of the Yeoman, he ends, not by confessing that the science in itself is true, but, ascribing to Aristotle and Plato the lore of the middle ages, he tells with grave irony how the philosophers had explained the mysterious by darker mystery, and, fencing with plain questions by one evasion after another, had finished with a protest that they were forbidden by the highest authority to reveal the secret; wherefore, concludes the Yeoman, since they may not tell how the stone may be discovered, I counsel that it is for the best to let it go:—

Than, thus conclude I, sin that God of heaven
Ne wol not that the philosophes neven
How that a man shal come unto this ston,
I rede as for the best to let it gon.

The same sound common sense taught Chaucer to reject astrology. In his treatise on the Astrolabe, in which he has shown himself a master in science, he writes:—"The Ascendent sothly is as well in all nativites, as in questions, and as in elections oft tymes is a thyng, whych that these Astrologiens greatly observen." "Nathelesse these bene observances of Judiciall mater and rytes of paynymys in whych my spirite hath no faythe ne knowynge of hir horuscopum." In the Franklin's tale again he speaks of astrology with utter contempt:—

Which book spake much of operations
Touching the eight and twenty mansions
That longen to the Mone, and swiche folie
As in our dayes n'is not worth a file

To make illusion
By swiche an apparence or joglerie,
(I can no termes of Astrologie)

To make his japes and his wretchednesse
Of swiche a superstitious cursednesse.

Not less admirable in their kind than the common sense which preserved him from the illusions of his day were the rare insight and power of expression which enabled him so thoroughly to distinguish and so perfectly to portray the two Canons, the impostor and the frantic projector—the latter perhaps the more dangerous of the two. The excellence of Ben Jonson's *Alchemist* lies in the display of various modes of covetousness, in the sensualist, the zealot, and the grovelling, greedy, credulous trader. The professor of the occult science Subtle, and the yeoman Face, are, like the false Canon, cheats. Our Yeoman's master was of another mould—a projector, an earnest believer, a bigot to alchemy, of iron will, laborious, patient, enduring, and disheartened by no failure. The impossible project with which his brain teemed had brought him to rags, and he was fain to look abroad for means to work out the splendid success of which he never doubted. Had he been an ill-natured projector he would have despised and hated the dolts whom, to use the Yeoman's words, he made as great fools as the wisest—despised them because they could not comprehend his great scheme, nor altogether dispel a shade of doubt in its verity; hated them because they yielded their substance grudgingly, with conditions for sharing the fruit of the intellectual power by which, in his own esteem, he was exalted immeasurably above them. The Yeoman's master was good-natured. He was wanting, as regarded his neighbour, in nothing but morality. If those whom he had well nigh drained of their substance grew slack to supply his need, as beggars stared them in the face, he cozened them with a good intent. He would not have them, for the sake of the small pittance left, cast away the sure and inestimable benefit of the stone; therefore he sought to strengthen them in his own unwavering faith by feigned experiments, in which one pound seemed to be made into two. Alchemy and astrology have given place to other illusions; but Chaucer's alchemist is of all time, and always, believing with his whole heart that he prepares blessings for those whose faith is not so strong as his, in danger of using deception as he drags them down to be smothered with himself in the silver mine under the little hill Lucre. The Yeoman is drawn with the same force and truth. While he has not yet escaped from the spell which the Canon's positive conviction and firm will had cast upon him, he

boasts of his master's dignity and power; but he is disturbed by the host's question why so worshipful a man went about so ragged and dirty; and, when forced to remember the life in blind alleys among thieves, how he had blown the fire till his countenance was like lead and his eyes bleared, and had only succeeded in making himself a beggar, his trust is shaken, and fails altogether when his lord rides away, not daring to listen to the tenor of his life told by his servant. Upheld by the society of his fellow-workers and fellow-believers, like every man of them the Yeoman was full of faith, and believed himself as wise as Solomon; but now, surrounded by sceptics, old scruples revived, and he recollected that he had always been in some sort a doubter, although—notwithstanding he had spent all he had, had borrowed gold which he could never pay, and feared in his heart that the elixir would not be found—he never could resolve to cease from the work; for there still lurked within him a creeping hope that the discovery might one day come to pass.

There is one scene—it may be, too diffuse, perhaps the last eighteen verses might have been spared—excellent in its kind, from which Ben Jonson seems to have borrowed the description of the designed and accomplished destruction by Subtle of the elixir which, as he pretended, he had all but completed when it vanished in smoke through the wickedness of Sir Epicure Mammon. In Chaucer the ruin is accidental, and he tells in one word that the accident was always happening. The Canon had tempered the metals on the fire; the crucible in which they were bubbling burst, and, farewell! all was gone. The boiling metal flew hither and thither; part through the wall, part into the ground; part was scattered about the floor, and the rest leaped into the roof. The workmen fell to chiding; such woe, rancour, and wrath were there as are found only in the kingdom of Satan. One said that the fault was in making up the fire; another, that it was in the blowing—"Then," says the Yeoman, "I was afraid, for to blow was my office." "Straw!" quoth a third, "you are ignorant and foolish; the mixture was not rightly tempered." "Nay," said a fourth, "hold and hearken to me; the cause was that our fire was not made of beechen wood." So they strove together until the strife called forth the Canon. Calm and gentle, *pietate gravem ac meritis*, he hushed the tumult, spake of the bursting of the crucible as of a thing for which he looked as duly as for his daily bread; yet promised that it should never happen again; and, confident as though the stone were already in the pocket of his ragged garment, bade them pluck up their hearts and be merry:—

What? quod my lord, ther n'is no more to don,
Of these perils I wol beware eftsoone.
I am right siker, that the pot was crased,
Be as be may, be ye no thing amased.
As usage is let swepe the flore as swithe;
Plucke up your hertes and be glad and blithe.

LITERARY POLICEMEN.

A GOOD deal was said lately as to the opinions of the police on the subject of the early closing of public-houses, and it was remarked that policemen might be inclined towards any course that would save themselves trouble. The Report of the Commissioner of Police for the Metropolis which has just appeared supports this remark, and shows that some zealous superintendents carry their zeal for early closing to an extreme point. The force has lately taken a decided literary turn, and the early closing of public-houses would no doubt afford to policemen greater leisure for that "educational" advancement which has become necessary for promotion. It was easy to believe the statement of Mr. Cross that, if public-houses were closed and coffee-shops remained open, intoxicating drink would be supplied in an illicit manner; and the Licensing Act provides that all places of refreshment shall be closed at the same time. But if the advice of the Superintendent of the Marylebone Division be adopted, a further measure of restriction will be proposed next Session. "Coffee-stalls," he says, "should be prohibited between 12 at night and 4 A.M. They are simply common nuisances, and are not, except in very special instances, required." We do not speak from actual knowledge, but we infer that the compound sold at these stalls under the name of coffee is not often genuine; and if on this ground the police proposed to treat the stalls as nuisances, we should feel a certain sympathy, which we admit to be wholly unjustifiable, in the success of their proceedings. It is possible indeed that the so-called coffee may be occasionally fortified with a spirit equally undeserving of the name of brandy, and although this may be an offence against the Excise, it would be venial, or even praiseworthy, in a sanitary point of view. The police would probably be well pleased if everybody in London would go to bed at midnight and stay there until four o'clock; and they desire at any rate that those who are in the streets between these hours should be cut off from all possibility of refreshment. Another superintendent says that "the keepers of fried fish, pie, and oyster shops" continue to give trouble to the police and annoyance to the inhabitants. This officer writes from Whitechapel, and we are pleased to hear that that district has grown so genteel that its inhabitants object to the eating—at least in a disorderly manner—of eel-pies. The consumption of these delicacies appears to proceed in the manner least satisfactory to the police at those shops which do not offer sitting accommodation to their customers. The Report states that the Excise authorities refuse to license certain shops on account of their not having the requisite accommo-

dation, and that these shops more especially give trouble. We presume that these shops, not having licences as refreshment-houses, do not venture to keep open after nine o'clock at night, and before that hour the trouble they give cannot be so very serious. Eating fried fish standing up is not, we should think, a particularly exhilarating occupation, and persons who can get jolly over an eel-pie must possess remarkable talent for conviviality under difficulties. We do not object to the closing of fried-fish shops, licensed or unlicensed, at the same hour as public-houses, but this worthy officer, taking his tone doubtless from the Home Office as it was under Lord Aberdare, seems to wish to close these shops altogether. Some of his colleagues seem to think it enough to say that "loose characters" frequent a shop in order to condemn it, but we venture to remark that even a prostitute may be lawfully supplied with an eel-pie. On particular occasions the West-end of London suffers from irruptions of "roughs" who are believed to be of Eastern origin, and probably if we pictured to ourselves these barbarians at the hearth fires of their race, we might conceive them to be engaged in the consumption of eel-pies purchased with coppers extracted from the pockets of West-enders.

It is gratifying to hear that in the Paddington division "only one crime of any magnitude" has been committed, and consequently the detective officers "have not had their energies directed to the apprehension of great offenders," who would probably have escaped. In this state of comparative leisure the superintendent of the division has addressed his mind to the consideration of the "educational test for promotion," and the style of his remarks convinces us that he at least need not fear the application of the test to which he objects. This test, he says, though it gives to the public intelligent, well-spoken, and well-informed men, shuts out many who would make the best officers. He would not suggest that there should be no educational qualification required, but he does think, and so do we, that upon the strong recommendation of the superintendent, the Civil Service examination might be waived in certain cases. We regard the method of examination as better than jobbery for admission; but as inapplicable, or nearly so, to promotion, which should depend upon the sense which a man's superiors have of his efficiency. The notion of the Civil Service Examiners selecting a detective sergeant by competition is rather whimsical. I have, says the writer, divisional detectives who are clever, experienced men, and but for the one drawback of want of education, would make the best detective sergeants, "for they are most energetic in the pursuit of offenders, will stand or lie in a mews, in a ditch, in a stable, a cab, or in a box, and will watch for hours without stirring, on purpose to catch or to keep observation on some persons whom they suspect, which I am afraid the educated detective would not do, and from their knowledge of crime and its perpetrators are certainly the best men to give instructions to others in intricate cases, but want of education keeps them from such a position." Certainly the mania for examination has gone pretty far if we apply it to the selection of officers of the detective police. It is doubtful whether an examiner could be found to set a paper on "Crime and its Perpetrators"; and the capacity for standing patiently up to the neck in a dunghap seems scarcely to admit of being measured by marks. The ingenious persons who undertake to choose detective officers by this method would perhaps be capable of proposing to set papers to all the inhabitants of a street until they discovered the perpetrator of a crime committed in it. Another superintendent testifies with equal emphasis against imposing an educational test on sergeants. "I find," he says, "that the very best policemen as regards thief-taking are men who generally are unable to pass the examination required for a sergeant." Thus a constable seized a suspected burglar and held him until assistance came, in spite of a violent blow with a "jemmy," under which perhaps a more scholarly head might have yielded. Another superintendent suggests, with even more force, that the educational test imposed upon a sergeant before he can become inspector should be modified. There are, he says, many sergeants "good practical policemen," well qualified for inspectors, who would fail to pass the educational examination, as we can quite believe. The wonder is that this absurd system of examination should have established itself so strongly.

We must admit, however, that by examination or other means the literary character of the police has been well sustained, and we can only hope that the authors of the district Reports before us have not disused the truncheon as they became familiar with the pen. Here and there severe criticism might find a blemish. Thus, one superintendent states that "stray dogs appear to be as prolific as ever"—meaning, not that stray dogs of the female sex produce puppies while in custody of the force, but only that stray dogs are numerous. The same officer discourses in a high moral strain upon the lamentable fact that "persons of a position in society" are among the visitors to night houses. He thinks they would never do so "if they would give the subject but a moment's serious reflection, and consider the result to themselves if their friends and relations were cognizant of their conduct." There are some twenty superintendents of police, and every one of them could write an essay in this style, and probably among them they could compose a magazine and review. Thus much education has done for the police, but whether it has made them more patient and skilful in watching and detecting thieves is questionable. The writers of the Reports take credit, and we hope justly, for having administered the Contagious Diseases Acts so that the prejudice once entertained by many persons against

these Acts has become a thing of the past. An enthusiastic superintendent states that those persons now see that "the despised daughter of frailty" has a way of escaping from her degrading position through the kind influence of those with whom she is brought into contact by the operation of the Acts. The number of naval stragglers brought in by the police has been less than the year before, and this is treated as a result of "an improved tone of morality in the navy;" which must be gratifying to those commanders who take an interest in the welfare of the crews entrusted to their charge, "and who, it is pleasing to note, are becoming more numerous every day." We will not be so unkind as to suggest that the diminished number of stragglers brought in might be ascribed to relaxed vigilance on the part of the police. But we cannot help fearing that thief-taking and other cognate business may come to be regarded as secondary to the general supervision of the conduct and condition of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, from captains in the navy to despised daughters of frailty and prolific dogs. It surely is beyond the province of the Superintendent of Police at Portsmouth Dockyard to estimate the degree of interest which naval officers take in the welfare of their ships' companies. The Superintendent at Woolwich Dockyard is happy in the occurrence of a topic particularly suitable to the display of his literary talent. "The year has been distinguished for visits made to the Arsenal by august personages." The Hereditary Grand Duke and Duchess of Russia and suite were received by their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, and the Heads of Departments, &c. "The 21st June will long be remembered in Woolwich as the day on which His Majesty the Shah visited the Arsenal." It is not perhaps surprising that the Shah's visits to public places should have particularly impressed the memory of policemen, because his Majesty carried on his august person diamonds which all the thieves of London must have regarded with longing and despairing eyes as a magnificent but wholly unattainable "swag." Nevertheless we do not see the necessity of recording the names of the distinguished civil and military officers who accompanied or received the Shah, unless indeed it had been added that none of them had their pockets picked. "The day was beautifully fine" and many thousands of well-dressed persons "availed themselves of the privilege" of standing on the grass plots to view the ceremony. Then came the Hereditary Grand Duke of Russia and the Prince of Wales, and a few days later the Shah turned up again within the territory of this most fortunate of superintendents. This time he came to view Greenwich Hospital; he was attended by notabilities as before, and "a *déjeuner* of the most *recherché* description" awaited him in the Painted Hall. This is really too much. We are sorry that the literary exercises of the police should end in unmitigated penny-announcing. But these are the beautiful results of education.

DEAN STANLEY ON GENERAL COUNCILS.

DEAN STANLEY has contributed to the *Contemporary Review* a short paper on "Christianity and Ultramontanist," designed, as he informs his readers, as a slight contribution—it is certainly a very slight one—towards completing a discussion recently carried on in that magazine. He adds, and the statement is repeated soon afterwards, that "it confines itself to the historical aspect of the subject." And to its historical aspect, especially in one important particular on which the writer has chiefly dwelt, our criticism will also be confined. We might indeed question at starting the historical correctness of the Dean's rather peculiar definition of Ultramontanist, as the theory that "in all times and places Christianity has been propagated by a corporation or caste of men, who have been the exclusive depositaries and expounders of its truths"; whereas the opposite, and as he holds the true, theory is that Christianity is propagated and the advance of truth and goodness accomplished, not by one particular corporation or order of men, or through any one form of polity, but "by the joint influences of all good elements in human nature, and in the order of the world, working together." This distinction of theories is, on the face of it, what logicians call a cross division, for no one in his senses ever imagined that the advance of truth and goodness in the world depended solely on the ministrations of a clerical corporation; while on the other hand there are probably not many who would care to maintain that Christianity has been, or is ever likely to be, propagated in the world without such direct agencies being called into play. The Dean is indeed himself obliged to allow that perhaps no one has held either view "with absolute consistency;" and he might have added that probably no one has ever professed to hold either view, in the form here stated, at all. What he really means, or must charitably be presumed to mean, is that one party holds an organized and visible ministry, with certain inherent rights and powers, to be part and parcel of the divine institution of Christianity, while another regards all such claims as mere variable accidents. In this sense his two theories have no doubt an historical existence, and the former might be roughly described as the Catholic theory, though it has been equally maintained by large bodies external to the Roman Catholic Church, as for instance by the entire Eastern and a large section of the English Church. At all events it is certainly not Ultramontanist, which, if we "confine ourselves to the historical aspect of the subject," means a particular theory about Papal rights and prerogatives maintained by one, and denied by another, party in the Roman Catholic Church. On the re-

spective merits of their views the Dean's slight contribution throws no light whatever. He probably thinks the controversy beneath his notice, and considers both sides about equally in the wrong; and of course he has a right to his own opinion on the subject. Only it remains true that the title of his paper is a misnomer. And its incongruity becomes the more amusingly conspicuous when we find him taking, as the chief and "most obvious case," for testing the historical weakness of what he calls the Ultramontane theory, the example of General Councils. No doubt Ultramontanes, being Roman Catholics, are obliged to admit the authority of General Councils; but, if there is one point which sharply distinguishes their theological attitude from that of the opposite section of their co-religionists, it is their studied depreciation of Councils in comparison with the loftier and more available authority of Popes. However, we are not going to discuss here the abstract merits of Catholic and Protestant, or of ecclesiastical and Erastian views of Church government—and this latter theory is what the writer is throughout really advocating—still less the pros and cons of Ultramontanism proper, to which he scarcely adverts at all. He has given us an historical summary of the action of General Councils from Nicea to Trent, according to his own estimate of their proceedings, and to a brief examination of some of its leading points we propose to devote such space as remains to us.

The Dean of Westminster has written some Historical Sketches of the Eastern Church, and was once a Professor of Ecclesiastical History. While therefore an attack on the pretensions of General Councils struck us as a very strange method of illustrating the falsehood of Ultramontanism, we turned with considerable interest to his review of the proceedings of those assemblies in times past. We are sorry to be obliged to add that we turned from it after a careful and wondering perusal with a blank sense of mingled perplexity and disappointment. Though he professes to be running through the whole line of General Councils, the Dean has in fact selected seven only out of the twenty or twenty-one commonly so-called—four of the ancient and three of the mediæval Church—whereby to illustrate his theories. The first four Councils from Nice to Chalcedon, to which the Church of England appeals for her standard of heresy, are thus summarily dismissed. "The Council of Nicea—what is there that actually remains to us from that venerable assembly? A creed which, however good in itself, was for the most part not composed by the Council, but only adopted by it . . . and of which the only word of importance inserted by the Council was adopted as a mere party move, and afterwards hardly ever used by Athanasius, its chief champion." The Nicene Creed was not composed by the Council of Nice in precisely the same sense in which the Toleration Act was not composed by the English Parliament. And it would be just as true to say that an Act of Parliament is not really the work of Parliament, but of the member who proposes or the draftsman who puts it into shape, as that creeds or canons are not really the work of the Council which authenticates them. And as to Athanasius's politic and provisional abstinence from the use of the famous formula (*homoousios*), in order to win over the Semi-Arians, it proves nothing whatever as to the fitness of the term for the purpose for which it was originally devised, and to which it has been applied from that day to this. Of the Council of Constantinople we are told still more briefly, and with even less approach to accuracy, "Nothing is now cherished except a portion of a creed which it certainly did not compose." From the Council of Ephesus "there remains only the famous word *theotokos*, which has not been deemed worthy of acceptance in any Protestant Church"—a statement which is incorrect if the Church of England is meant to be included under the category, and irrelevant if it is not. For no decrees of the ancient Councils are deemed worthy of acceptance by the foreign Protestant communions. We are finally asked "How many Christian pastors of any Church have gone to the stormy debates and ambiguous decisions of the Council of Chalcedon"—which most unambiguously condemned Eutychianism—"for the purpose of refreshing their spiritual life?" It would be about as reasonable to ask how many Christians have gone to the *Pilgrim's Progress* for the purpose of learning the true doctrine of the two natures of Christ. We have no time to enter here on a vindication of the first four General Councils, and it is quite enough to observe that Dean Stanley has judged them—detailed inaccuracies apart—by tests which are so transparently inapplicable as to deprive his statement of any value whatever. But, as he refers to Hooker as a high authority in a later part of the article, and as Hooker was certainly very far removed from any suspicion of Ultramontanism, we may perhaps venture to remind our readers of a well-known passage in the fifth book of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* giving his very different estimate of the matter:—

To gather, therefore, into one sum all that hitherto hath been spoken touching this point, there are but four things which concur to make complete the whole state of our Lord Jesus Christ: His Deity, His manhood, the conjunction of both, and the distinction of the one from the other being joined in one. Four principal heresies there are which have in those things withstood the Truth: Arians by bending themselves against the Deity of Christ; Apollinarians by maiming and misinterpreting that which belongeth to His human nature; Nestorians by rending Christ asunder and dividing Him into two persons; the followers of Eutyches by confounding in His person those natures which they should distinguish. Against these there have been four most famous ancient general councils; the council of Nice to define against Arians, against Apollinarians the council of Constantinople, the council of Ephesus against Nestorians, against Eutychians the Chalcedon council.

And, after speaking of the terms used for this purpose, he pro-

ceeds:—"Within the compass of which four heads I may truly affirm that all heresies which touch the Person of Christ, whether they have arisen in these later days or in any age heretofore, may be with great facility brought to confine themselves." On the theological bearings of the matter we of course say nothing here. But the extract just given will at least suffice to prove that writers not less eminent or learned than Dean Stanley, and quite as little open to the imputation of Ultramontanism, are completely at issue with him as to the substantial and permanent services rendered to Christianity by the ancient Councils of the Church.

From the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the reviewer passes at a bound to what he somewhat enigmatically calls "the Council of the Lateran." As there were four Lateran Councils, the first of which was held in 1123 and the last in 1215, we were at first wholly at a loss to know what Council the Dean had in his mind. His comment on "the Council of the Lateran" is that "it gave us its sanction of Transubstantiation and of the Albigenian Crusade." The former part of this statement might be applied to two of the Lateran Councils; the latter is not true, except in a very indirect sense, of any of them. The teaching of Berengarius on the Eucharist—which may be described in later phraseology as Zwinglian—was condemned at the Second Lateran Council, and the dogma of Transubstantiation formally defined at the fourth. It is apparently to this last that the reviewer refers, for, although the crusade to which it gave its sanction was not the Albigenian, but the fifth crusade to the Holy Land, afterwards conducted by Andrew II. King of Hungary, it assigned to De Montfort the cities taken from the Albigenians in France, and may thus be said to have given a kind of *ex post facto* sanction to the war. Had the sanction been more direct, the case is not such a simple one in its "historical aspects" as Dean Stanley appears to suppose. The Albigenian heresies were to the full as violent an outrage on the public opinion of Christendom in that day as Mormonism is in our own, and a high ecclesiastical dignitary might have been expected to remember that the direct sanction given in the Old Testament to the extermination of the Canaanites does not stand less in need of explanation than the indirect condonation accorded after the fact by the Fourth Lateran Council—if it is the fourth to which he refers—to the wars of Simon de Montfort. Once more the reviewer passes *sicco pede*, not this time over eight, but over more than two centuries, and four intervening General Councils, and pounces on the Council of Constance—the very last, one would have thought, in the whole series to be included in an indictment against Ultramontanism. And here he is even less felicitous than in his dealings with "the Council of the Lateran." At Constance, to quote his own burning words, "the blameless John Huss was burnt alive, the infamous John Petit, and the infamous John XXII. (XXIII.?) with difficulty condemned, almost condoned." And then, appropriating a statement of Hallam's which later criticism has conspicuously disproved, he adds that "it is easy to weigh the retrenchment of a few abuses against the formal sanction of an atrocious maxim." This of course refers to the supposed decree of Constance, triumphantly cited by Gieseler, that no faith is to be kept with heretics, which however, if not a pure fabrication throughout, is at best a draft of a motion proposed by some member of the Council, but certainly never accepted. Nor had the Council any need to adopt it as an apology for burning John Huss. Dean Stanley should know better than to endorse the worn-out calumny about what Coleridge calls with ingenious infelicity "the Pope-wrought perfidy, that made an empire's plighted faith a lie," forgetting that the "perfidy" at all events could not be "Pope-wrought" at a time when there was no Pope. But in fact there was no perfidy at all. John Huss came to Constance, as he himself repeatedly stated, with no other safeconduct than a verbal promise from the Emperor of protection on his journey, which was faithfully kept. The written safeconduct reached him after his arrival there and guaranteed him against all violence on the road to or from Constance in the event of his return, but did not and could not guarantee him against the sentence of the supreme tribunal to which he had himself appealed, and by whose judgment he had over and over again declared his readiness to abide. That burning heretics is an "atrocious" practice we have no desire to dispute, but it was in accordance with the universal custom and sentiment of the day, and Huss himself did not complain of the sentence on the ground that it was a breach of faith, or that burning heretics is wrong, but simply on the ground that he was not a heretic. But, judged by any standard of doctrine which the Council could possibly recognize, he was undoubtedly a heretic, and it so happened that some of his opinions were of a nature to be far more alarming to civil than to ecclesiastical authorities, and would, if consistently carried out, have made all regular government in Church or State an impossibility. Hence the extreme bitterness manifested against him by the Emperor Sigismund when it became clear what his real opinions were. As to the Dean's sensational contrast of Huss with "the infamous John Petit and the infamous John XXII.," that may be dismissed in very few words. Jean Petit, as we had occasion to mention the other day, wrote a work in defence of tyrannicide which the Council of Constance condemned. His doctrine may be "infamous," but it was maintained by a host of later writers, Catholic and Protestant, to some of whom at all events even Dean Stanley would scarcely venture to apply that epithet, and we are not aware of any charges against the personal character of the author. As to "the infamous John XXII." (XXIII.) we must be content to refer the Dean to Hefele's volume on the Council of Constance, his utter ignorance of which is attested by every word he has written on the subject. John was

certainly no saint, but there is no evidence that he was any worse than the general run of dignified ecclesiastics of the day, though he was greatly their superior in ability. The contemporary judgment of Leonardo of Arezzo is probably not far from the mark:—"Vir in temporalibus quidem magnus, in spiritualibus vero nullus omnino atque ineptus." It was more on ecclesiastical than moral grounds, and on account of his breach of faith in deserting the Council, that it suspended and deposed him.

It is admitted that the Council of Trent effected many useful reforms, and that the chapters on Justification throw a good deal of light on an important subject, but we are asked whether "its acts contain anything like a code of permanent and universal truth," as though it were the business of a Council to compose a supplementary Bible. And in the same spirit the writer, possibly haunted by some vague consciousness that his detailed indictment against the acts of General Councils is not very conclusive, proceeds to notice their omissions:—

How many are the good words and works in which the Councils have had no part? The Creeds: Even the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creed is in substance the creed not of a Council but of Eusebius and Epiphanius. The Apostles' Creed, and, with all its merits and demerits, the Athanasian Creed, is not sanctioned by any Council at all. The Canon of Scripture: It was not adopted, or sanctioned, or explained by any Council until the Council of Trent; and the decision of that assembly, recognizing as authorized only the received version of the Vulgate, no educated man, either Roman Catholic or Protestant, can in the present day accept. Theology: Is there any single theological question which any Council or Synod has argued or decided with an ability equal to that of any of the great theologians, lay or clerical? The nearest approach to it are the chapters on Justification in the decrees of Trent, and on the Bible in the Westminster Confession. But how inadequate to the needs of the case, how inferior to the truly inspired utterances of individual genius!—to the enlightenment of the world by Origen, by Jerome, by Augustine, by Dante, by Hooker, by Bacon, by Thomas à Kempis, by Bossuet, by Luther! The formation of the hymnology, or of the music, or of the liturgy, or of the morals of Christendom—all these were the works of public opinion, of general instinct, or of gifted individuals—not the work either of a general council or of the corporate or synodical action of the clergy as such.

And again soon afterwards we are solemnly informed that the whole literature of Christendom, its poetry, philosophy, history, hymnology, science, and theology, its art and legislation for at least three hundred years—during which period by the way there have been no General Councils—its charities and philanthropic institutions, are the work of other agencies. No doubt. But it is impossible to read this portentous catalogue of the services which Councils have failed to render without being reminded of the very similar complaint made against *Paradise Lost*. "After all, it proves nothing." After all, says the Dean of Westminster in effect, whatever else Councils may have accomplished, they did not give us the art, the literature, the science, the painting, the poetry, the history, the hospitals, not even the theology of Europe. They cannot match the intellect of Augustine, or the depth of Origen, or the wisdom of Hooker, or the science of Bacon or the genius of Bossuet, or the devotion of Thomas à Kempis. And therefore at the bar of history they are self-condemned. Neither, we may add, did the English Parliament give us our national literature, or poetry, or music, our ancient Universities, our churches, our scientific institutions, our railways, our electric telegraph, our benevolent societies, or even our political economy. Shakespeare and Milton and Wordsworth, Gibbon and Hume, Adam Smith, Burke, Watt, Stephenson, Faraday, Mill, and hosts besides of not less memorable names, are due to other agencies than can be found in the Palace of Westminster. Even the laws made in Parliament "are not composed but merely adopted by it." Therefore it is absurd to talk of Parliamentary government as the palladium of our liberties and source of legitimate authority. The advance of the national spirit and national welfare is promoted "by the joint influence of all good elements in [English] nature, and in the order of the world working together," and not by particular Acts of Parliament. It is hardly necessary to pursue the parallel further. We may hope that before the Dean again enters on the history of General Councils he will have paid a little more attention to the facts of the case, and have learnt to take rather a wider view of its bearings on the history of the Church and the world.

TEMPLE BAR.

THE disturbance of Temple Bar is at any rate a visible proof that work has been seriously commenced upon the Law Courts. The digging of the foundations of the new edifice has been proceeded with so energetically, and we might almost say inconsiderately, as to cause a slipping or sinking of the ground supporting the old and, as some would say, venerable structure. It is perhaps not to be regretted that a question which might have given trouble has been thus practically settled. The decision is said to be reserved for the Common Council when they meet after their vacation, but, howsoever they may invigorate themselves by change of air and scene, they will find their strength unequal to keeping Temple Bar in its familiar place. If it cannot stand without hoarding and shoring it had better come down, because the most enthusiastic antiquary can hardly admire a structure composed partly of stone and partly of planks and timber. And further, although the Bar remains, and is as well as can be expected under the circumstances, the gates are gone, and gone never to return. The ceremony of closing them on the approach of a herald with a proclamation can never be repeated. We do not know whither the gates have been carried, but we are sure

that not even a general and an army could bring them back. Lord Ellenborough desired on a memorable occasion to show that the wave of Afghan conquest had been rolled back from India by British power. But not even Lord Ellenborough could resist the progress of that change which has removed these gates from Temple Bar. It would indeed be almost as easy to replace above the Bar the mouldering heads of traitors. But if the Bar must lose its gates, it had better disappear altogether from its present site.

Yet the removal of Temple Bar, whenever it shall be consummated, will be matter of regret, just as we regret the substitution of commodious modern houses with plate-glass shop-fronts for the dark and awkward, but picturesque, dwellings of mediæval traders. Nothing so surely carries back the mind to the past as its visible monuments, and a mind can hardly be in a healthy state which dwells wholly in the present. On this account we think it would be worth while to re-erect Temple Bar on the best site that can be found for it. As long as it stands anywhere, the recollection will survive that it served, among other purposes, to exemplify the justice or vengeance of Government against traitors. For many months a play has been performed at the Olympic Theatre of which the subject is a Jacobite plot for the assassination of King William III. The play is founded upon a real plot for which the authors suffered death and gave their heads and limbs for the ghastly ornamentation of Temple Bar. These victims were of the party which a few years before had triumphed even more savagely. After Monmouth's defeat there was no town or village of Somersetshire that had supported him which had not always before its eyes horrible examples of the penalty of rebellion. Macaulay relates that a labouring man who assisted the executioner at Taunton in the disgusting process of seething the quarters of traitors in pitch was called in his village "Tom Boilman," was shunned like Cain, and perished by lightning, which his fellow-villagers regarded as Heaven's vengeance for his sinful and shameful work. It is easier for us to conceive the state of mind which delighted to witness cruel and sanguinary punishments than that which endured the obtrusion of hideous objects on daily life. Every time that the Guildhall and the Halls of the great Companies entertained guests of rank and fashion from beyond Temple Bar, these guests passed under an archway garnished with human heads and limbs. Belief in the deterrent effect of punishment was in those days absolute, and in a struggle for life and death between rival parties in politics and religion all means were used without remorse to put down and keep down enemies. We could easily bring ourselves under the influence of terror and hatred to cut off heads, although we may now think such severity far from our refined natures. But it may be doubted whether any panic or provocation could induce us to fix our victims' heads on spikes and look at them as we drove to dine off turtle and venison with the Lord Mayor and aldermen. The nearest approach to the feelings of those times was made in India, when the blowing away of Sepoys from guns was used as a punishment, doubtless necessary, for mutiny. Colonel Stuart, in his *Reminiscences of a Soldier*, has lately described the share which duty compelled him to take in one of these executions. He placed a party of his men immediately behind the gun, and we will not enter into further details. Yet this punishment was adopted under the belief, apparently well founded, of its deterrent effect; and as Colonel Stuart writes:—"We were living in times when no one could tell what a day would bring forth, and we had plenty of evidence that the corps most faithful yesterday would with pleasure cut our throats to-day." These words of a man now living may help us to understand how our ancestors, when King William III. had narrowly escaped assassination on his way for a day's hunting in Richmond Park, cut off with alacrity the heads of the conspirators, and stuck them up on Temple Bar.

Let us try to realize another event nearer to our own time, which furnished indeed the latest horrors of the Bar. In the month of November 1745 the state of affairs in England was most alarming. Prince Charles Edward had landed in Scotland in the last days of July, and being joined by large numbers of Highlanders, had outmanœuvred General Cope, the commander of the few Royal troops in Scotland, taken possession of Edinburgh, and defeated the Royal army at Preston Pans. Meanwhile, regiments which had shared the honourable but disastrous battle at Fontenoy were brought from Holland to London and marched to the North. Dutch, Danes, and Hessians, as well as English regiments, were employed against the Highland savages who were threatening to capture and sack London. The King reminded the officers of the Guards of the precarious condition of the country, and told them that, though he had had so many recent instances of their exertions, yet the necessities of the time induced him to demand their services again. Thus exhorted, the Guards marched to Lichfield and joined the Duke of Cumberland, who warned the Government that they must prepare for the defence of London in case the Highlanders should slip past him. There is a tradition that the Duke hanged a tollgate-keeper who gave him untrue information as to the enemy's movements. This week in which Englishmen have invaded Scotland in large numbers may be opportune for remembering the Pretender's march to Derby. At that day a Highlander was regarded not with sentimental admiration, but with disgust and horror. On the 2nd December the Duke, in order to intercept the insurgents on their march to Chester, advanced to Stone, expecting an encounter; but Lord George Murray, the Commander-in-Chief of the Highland

army, suddenly turned with his men to the left, gained by a forced march the high road to Ashbourne, and on the 4th reached Derby, thus placing himself between the Duke and the metropolis. The *History of the Grenadier Guards* lately published gives some curious details of the military incidents of this, the last campaign on English soil. The Londoners were resolute in adherence to their Protestant and Hanoverian King. "Several wealthy citizens enlisted as volunteers in the Guards." A camp was formed to cover London, and the movement of some companies of Guards thither furnished Hogarth with the idea of his picture of the "March to Finchley," which, however, is a caricature. Scouts were sent into Northamptonshire and Huntingdonshire, and Englishmen armed and drilled generally, and prepared themselves to dare and endure, and, when their time came, to inflict, just as did their descendants when the tide of Indian mutiny rose daily higher, and showed as yet no sign of turning. If the Highlanders really had reached London, we may doubt whether romance and poetry combined could have made the name of Macdonald and Cameron other than odious in Southern ears. But they, finding no support in England, retreated from Derby towards their own country, and the Duke pursued them, having for expedition mounted a detachment of Guards on horses furnished by the farmers. But soon an alarm of invasion from Dunkirk recalled the Duke to London, and in his absence General Hawley was defeated by the Highlanders at Falkirk. However, the French did not strike at the right time; the tranquillity of London was restored, the volunteers returned to their civil duties, and the Duke marched again to Scotland, and crushed the last hopes of the Stuarts at Culloden. The termination of the rebellion was followed by the trials and punishment of its leaders. Lords Balmerino and Kilmarnock were executed on Tower Hill, and other rebels suffered on Kennington Common. Lord Lovat was executed a few months afterwards. It cannot be said, looking at the magnitude and character of this rebellion, at the ideas which had always prevailed as to the treatment of vanquished rebels, and at the length and bitterness of the struggle between Catholics and Protestants and the Houses of Stuart and Hanover, that these punishments were excessive either in number or degree. Death to noble traitors by the axe had always been the law; and it had become habitual, and was supposed to be a salutary deterrent practice, to stick their heads on spikes and leave them to wither in the sun and wind. Thus it was natural that Temple Bar should become once more and for the last time a place of skulls. Happily for us our civil and religious differences are now for the most part settled at the polling-booth. But if we suppose the fate of Throne and Church to depend upon an imminent battle between one army advancing from Derby and another encamped at Finchley, we shall gain some idea of the excitement of the minds of Londoners in December 1745, and shall not violently blame, even if we may regret, the severities which they wreaked on their defeated enemies a year later. Rather let us own that in a time of equal peril we could not show more courage, and might easily show as much blood-thirstiness. This lesson Temple Bar as long as it stands may profitably teach.

THE SURREY ASSIZES.

AT the conclusion of the Guildford Assizes Mr. Baron Bramwell made some important remarks upon the business done or left undone there, which have been supplemented by an interesting statement in the *Times* of what may be called the birth and character of the causes entered for trial, and of the ends they came to. This statement is valuable as showing the condition to which the judicial arrangements of the country have been reduced, and the urgent need of that reform which the Judicature Act professes to supply. The business of this assize, so far as it has come before the judges, has been disposed of by two judges in thirteen working days, but this could only be done by the assistance of a learned gentleman, one of Her Majesty's Counsel, sitting in a third Court, and trying common jury cases. We do not object to this practice, which a glance at the Assize reports will show to be frequent, and we have only to remark upon it that the country thus gets the benefit of the service of a highly-trained lawyer without paying for it. The experience thus gained is doubtless useful to those who may hereafter become judges, and the practice of including Queen's Counsel and Serjeants in the Commissions of Assize is part of that ancient system which we should desire to protect against hasty and ill-considered change. But there has been held at Guildford what was virtually a fourth Court, in which another Queen's Counsel has been sitting as arbitrator in a case which, under the existing system, could not be tried in a regular court at all. This was an action by a Surrey landlord against a tenant for breach of covenants as to course of husbandry, and it involved matters with which a jury of farmers would be far better acquainted than one of tradesmen. The sittings of the arbitrator have been public, and they have been freely attended by the farmers of the neighbourhood, among whom the case has excited considerable interest. This statement, which we take from the *Times*, would go far, in our judgment, to show the expediency of continuing to hold an assize at Guildford. It is desirable that farmers and other classes should attend the hearing of cases in which they take an interest, because they may thus learn something that may be useful to them.

Wherever courts of justice are open auditors frequent them, and the attendance upon judicial proceedings is a valuable part of political education. This case appears to have been peculiarly suitable for trial by a jury chosen, according to the old principle, from the neighbourhood where the case arose, and we assume that the reason for referring it to an arbitrator was the impossibility of obtaining at this time of the year the attention of a judge and jury. But even if we suppose that the case was unsuitable, from its complication, for trial by jury, that is no sufficient reason, irrespectively of present rules of practice, why it should not be tried before a judge. The consent of the parties which would be necessary to arbitration would suffice for trial before a judge without a jury, but the consent of the judge would also be necessary, and that he might reasonably withhold. He might fairly say that he had not time to get through the regular duty of the assize and could not assume any responsibility that did not properly belong to him. It comes, in fact, to this, that a cause which would require several days to try cannot be tried at all, and the parties must provide a judicial tribunal at their own expense. If a tax were imposed upon all suitors alike none could complain, and, in fact, a tax is imposed upon all suitors who try their cases before special jurors. But it often happens that suitors cannot have what they want even by paying for it. In fact the judges who hold the Summer Assize are like tradesmen who cannot meet their liabilities. The most importunate or lucky creditors get paid in full, and other creditors get nothing. Mr. Baron Bramwell appears to think that even if assizes continue to be held at Guildford and the two other towns which have been used to have them, the suitors would prefer to resort, when the new judicial system is established, to London; and perhaps to a large extent they would. All we should contend for is that the option of doing so or not should be reserved to them. If a case arises in the neighbourhood of Guildford, it is easier to try that case at Westminster than at Croydon, because the journey by rail is half an hour shorter, and there are more trains. But if a case arises in the neighbourhood of Guildford, it may be tried at Guildford if the assize happens to be held there, and if not it may be tried at Westminster. There can be no possible objection to offering this alternative, except that it might involve an occasional waste of a judge's time, and this Mr. Baron Bramwell properly says ought not to weigh against it. He expects, indeed, that the County of Surrey will arrive at the conclusion that its assizes can be most conveniently held at Newington, and if that be so, there is little use in contending for the local principle, because Newington is part of the metropolis. We think there is much to be said against centralization, but if those most interested give up the contest, outsiders can hardly be expected to maintain it.

The remark of Mr. Baron Bramwell that "the question turns on *Bradshaw*" tells both ways, because, if it is easy for the suitors of Surrey to come to Westminster, it is easy also for the judges of Westminster to come to Guildford. As regards the alleged disposition of the county to do its business at Newington, it was explained at the county meeting held at Guildford on Thursday that, as regards the criminal business, the prisoners are at Newington already and it is inconvenient to remove them. As regards the civil business of Quarter Sessions, it appears that when the question of its removal was brought forward at Guildford it was rejected by a large majority, and when the same question was brought forward at Newington it was carried by a majority of one. Further discussion of this question will probably produce something like agreement as to what is the most convenient course. As regards the general question, it is manifest that the arrangement recently proposed of the circuits has gone upon the idea that there are only so many judges disposable, and, as two more judges are wanted for the North, they may be taken from the South. The people of Surrey may reasonably object to the question being dealt with in this way. Let the public convenience be first considered, and let the number of judges which it requires be appointed, but do not fix the number of judges and then compel the public convenience to adapt itself thereto. It has been suggested as one means of lightening the labours of judges at assizes that an enlarged criminal jurisdiction should be given to magistrates at Quarter Sessions. But this proposal also ought to be considered on its merits, and there is obviously much to be said against it. Supposing it to be adopted, there would be an immediate revival of the demand which has been frequently urged for appointing paid Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, and this certainly would cost more than any probable saving of judges' salaries. At present, when a judge tries prisoners at the assizes many magistrates come into court and listen, and they are likely to hear something that may be useful in the performance of their own duties. It was well said by a speaker at the meeting that "the object of the assizes is that people should see and feel how the law is administered," and thus learn to respect and place confidence in the law. That is an object of the highest importance which cannot be exactly appreciated in money, and which therefore some minds have a tendency to disregard. The members for the county of Surrey will doubtless press this consideration upon Government and Parliament. They may fairly urge that the reason why so few county cases had been tried at the late assize was that "the parties knew that, if the proceedings were likely to last any time, the chances were that the case would not be heard." It is desirable, however, that these cases should be tried in the county, and that proper time should be given for trying them. Suitors are now subjected to a constantly increasing pressure to consent to

refer or settle their cases, and if they resist to-day they yield to-morrow. The *Times* states that more than a hundred cases out of 160 were withdrawn from trial, or disposed of without being really tried, and we may be tolerably sure that if the same cause list were commenced at Westminster next November by a judge sitting continuously, a much larger proportion of them would be tried. If this be so, the necessity is manifest for some such improvement as the Judicature Act proposes. The truth is that if the lawyers had been alive to their own interest, they would have established continuous sittings with juries at Westminster or in the City of London twenty years ago, and they would have devised some system by which, before the expense of preparing for trial was incurred, the cases which are and are not suitable for trial by jury could have been distinguished. Few judges who have had much experience would desire to take upon themselves the decision of questions on which there is contradictory testimony, and in what are called "running down" cases judges usually congratulate themselves that the question is for the jury, and not for them. In these cases and many others, the various experience of the jurymen is a valuable help to their decision, and then there are questions as to the amount of damages which no judge could settle satisfactorily to himself, and which are far better settled by persons brought together casually for the purpose. It would be inconvenient, to say the least, that a judge should acquire a reputation for placing a high value upon the wounded feelings of young ladies, or should have to place a value on their feelings when he was known to hold a strong opinion that they ought not to be compensated in money at all. We do not think, therefore, that trial by jury in suitable cases is likely to become unpopular, but it is time to put an end to the absurd practice of summoning jurors to try 160 cases when it is perfectly well known that not one-third of them will be, or can be, really tried.

BASE-BALL.

AS a man's nature is most readily detected in his unguarded moments, so the characteristics of a nation appear most clearly in its games. The coolness, persistency, and careful skill of the English find an apt field for their exercise in cricket. The nervous fiery temperament of the Gaul allies itself happily to his love of finesse, his possession of the *esprit Gaulois*, in the quick yet well-planned combat of the foil. The same tendency to let off superfluous energy by the means of personal conflict which belongs to the fencing schools of Paris assumes a form which has a more serious and a more grotesque side among the students of Germany. With them the harmless encounter of buttoned foils is replaced by the duel with the *schläger*, a blade peculiar to the German Universities, which from its combined tenuity, flexibility, and sharpness, may be said to resemble a harlequin's wand with a razor's edge. To mitigate the savagery of the contests which might be entered into with such dangerous weapons as these, the practical good sense which pertains to the German character stepped in and muffled the student duellists to the chin in impenetrable paddings, while it protected their eyes with iron-rimmed spectacles. So thick is the leathern armour provided for the warriors that many of the cuts delivered with the keen blade are parried by the wadded right arm. In this curious arrangement of apparent danger and actual safety, the German mind perceives, as a rule, nothing ridiculous. On the contrary, the institution of duelling is regarded by the German student exactly as is that of cricket by the English public schoolboy or undergraduate. It is his physical religion. We remember a conversation between two undergraduates, one of an English, the other of a German University. The German inquired what were the sports in favour among the youth of English University life. There was cricket, he was told, and boating and various other athletic amusements. "But there is no duelling?" "No." "Ah, then it cannot really be a University." Preconceived ideas of duelling do not quite accord with its interpretation at a German University. In the world at large a duel used to imply an individual quarrel between two members of the community. Among German students it signifies merely a trial of skill between the members of two *corps*. Side is opposed to side exactly as in cricket; but each side offers only one representative at a time. Whatever shred of likeness there may be between the nose-slitting amusement of Bonn and Heidelberg and the cricket of our Universities or of our public schools, there is this wide difference, that Englishmen who have in their young days been devoted to cricket never lose their interest in it in after life, while the most renowned swordsman of a German *corps* will in the course of a few years regard his prowess as a vain thing fondly imagined. But indeed it would be as absurd seriously to compare cricket with this student duelling as with the cruel bull-fight of Spain or the lazy but harmless, if childish, *morra* of the Italians. It may be said that there is another game of some importance in Italy, which, resembling tennis in some points, may be called a variety of the genus cricket in that its component parts are a ball and a striking power. But this game is not sufficiently widespread or popular to deserve the title of national.

It would be surprising if America, cherishing many institutions of the old country, should pass over one so venerated as cricket. It is also in accordance with the spirit of independence which is the boast of Americans that, while they look kindly on the English national game, they should strike out a new game to be more especially their own. The friendly rivalry existing between

England and America led some while ago to a contest between the "wet-bobs," to use an Eton phrase, of either country, and it was only fair that the "dry-bobs" should show what they could do. Cricket-matches between Americans and Englishmen are not without precedent, for in 1859 America challenged England at cricket, and the challenge was accepted by the best English Eleven of the time, who went out to America and returned having reaped success. It is possible that the supremacy of base-ball over cricket was not then so firmly established as it is now on the other side of the Atlantic; now the older is clearly held inferior to the younger game. It may be that the love of invention, of creating something new, which belongs to a new people, has led to the up-raising of base-ball above all other games. Yet in the essence of base-ball there is nothing new. A letter in the *Times* has pointed out that in 1748 a game called base-ball was played by the family of Frederick Prince of Wales. It is possible that the resemblance between this and the American game of to-day extends further than the name. The origin of base-ball may be traced back without difficulty to the club-ball of the fourteenth century. In Strutt's *Sports and Pastimes* there is a representation of two men engaged in this amusement, or in one very closely akin to it. One is delivering a ball to the other, who stands with the deprecating aspect which seems inseparable from mediæval figures, ready to receive it with a rude kind of club. In this delivery of a ball and its reception with a bat, the germ both of cricket and base-ball is easily recognized. It is curious that the attitude of the two figures is more nearly approached in base-ball than in cricket. This may be taken as an indication either that the American game is an intermediate step between club-ball and cricket, or that the base-ball players have employed a conservative wisdom in rejecting the branches to get to the root of the tree. The former interpretation is likely to find general acceptance, inasmuch as all men who have been schoolboys will recognize in base-ball the development of a game which was common in their school days, and, being held inferior to cricket, was regarded rather as a trivial amusement wherewith to while away an odd half-hour than as a serious sport to which much time and practice were to be devoted. Base-ball is, in fact, a kind of glorified rounders.

The method in which the runs are obtained is precisely the same as at rounders. The rough humour which put a man out by hitting him with the ball as he ran has disappeared, and seems to have been replaced by the throwing of the ball into one of the goals or bases before the runner reaches it. The bat used is a development of the stump or stick employed at rounders by English schoolboys, and may be said to come between it and the cricket-bat, as the German student's *schläger* does between the small-sword and the sabre. That the use of the bat is not the most important feature in base-ball is at once evident. Thus one of the chief beauties of cricket is absent from the game. There are none of those pretty cuts, well-judged drives, and wary receptions of dangerous balls which are the delight of the spectators at Lord's. On the other hand, it may be said that most of the niceties of batting at cricket are lost upon spectators without special knowledge. The hard hitting which appears the main object of the batsman at base-ball appeals to all who see it, however ignorant they may be of the game. But the absence of a wicket to be attacked and defended is a serious disadvantage to base-ball in the eyes of on-lookers. In the matter of bowling also the American seems far inferior to the English game. The variety of the English bowling contrasts favourably with the apparent monotony of the pitching at base-ball. There is probably a great deal of skill in this which it is impossible to discern without a close acquaintance with the game; but the constant employment of the same action by all the bowlers strikes an English eye as wearisome. On the other hand, base-ball is free from the weariness which comes over the spectators of a cricket-match when steady play on both sides is evinced by the fact that for some half-hour or more nothing happens except the movement of the field and the change of bowlers at the end of every over. In base-ball, action is continuous and rapid. The interest lost in the matter of bowling and batting at base-ball is made up in that of fielding. After due allowance is made for the difference between a cricket ball and the ball which is employed in the American game, the fact remains that the fielding of the American players is singularly accurate. The certainty with which catches are made, the judgment and quickness with which the field back one another up, the neatness and rapidity with which balls are stopped and thrown in, might serve as models to cricketers. The employment of one of the side who are in to watch the movements of the field and advise the runner accordingly is a quaint device which savours of American acuteness. The running is of course a great element of the game, and is a very pretty feature in it. It gains in grace probably from the fact that the runner is not embarrassed by a bat. One curious circumstance of base-ball is the waste of force which follows from the rule according to which all hits must be made within certain limits. By this means all the fine hits in the direction of square leg go for nothing. Another remarkable feature of the game is the process which takes the place of stumping out by the wicket-keeper at cricket. If a runner unwarily advances too far from his base in order to gain beforehand some of the distance which he hopes to run, it seems competent for the bowler to put him out by throwing the ball into the base before he can return to it. This gives rise to the employment of the same kind of histrionic feints and ruses which make a distinguishing feature of American card-games.

A bowler will watch his opportunity two or three times, and apparently abandon the idea of outwitting the runner. Then, as he seems about to deliver the ball, with a marvellously rapid change of action he will do his best to throw the runner out. This amongst other things lends a variety to the game, and helps to keep the spectator amused. Base-ball is certainly pretty to look at, and probably appears a game of considerable skill and interest when the intricacies which it has gathered to itself in the process of development from rounders are mastered. It is not likely, however, to become so popular in England as to endanger the reign of cricket.

LOAN EXHIBITION FOR ALSACE AND LORRAINE.

A COLLECTION of choice paintings and rare works of art, which excites unwonted interest in France, and indeed throughout Europe, has been got together for the purpose of aiding the fugitives from Alsace and Lorraine in the project of planting a colony in Algeria. Among the contributors are the Duke of Aumale, the Count and Countess of Paris, the Duke of Chartres, the Duke of Broglie, Count Haussenville, several members of the Rothschild family, and MM. Thiers, Lebarthe, Gérôme, Hébert, Viardot, Wilson, with many others. Our English collectors have long been accustomed to place their treasures upon loan for the pleasure and instruction of the public; but French connoisseurs have hitherto shown a reserve in this respect which, on the present exceptional occasion, enhances the value of their favours. It is pleasant to find after the spoliation and impoverishment of France over a period of well nigh a century how much art treasure remains intact in private hands. It is true that events which denuded France enriched England; it is evident, for instance, that it might be possible to get together a finer collection of Sèvres China in London than in Paris; but seldom have we seen in any capital of Europe such rare examples of enamels, Henri-Deux ware, and tapestries. The collection of faïences françaises generally is good; there are some choice classic and early Christian ivories; and the examples of the French school of painting are also remarkable for number and excellence. In fine, this exhibition at the Palace of the President of the Legislative Body may be compared to a union, were it possible, of the British Institution with the Loan Exhibition of 1862. We must content ourselves with a general description of the works best worth notice.

The pictures, as usual, excite most interest, though, with the exception of those of the French school, they are of less value than the general *objets d'art*. The gem of the collection is "La Vierge d'Orléans," by Raffaele, lent by the Duke of Aumale. The other examples of the Italian schools are, with few exceptions, either doubtful or second-rate; in such dubious or inferior category may safely be placed "Saint-Antoine tourmenté par les démons," by Michael Angelo; "La Sainte Famille," by Fra Angelico; another "Sainte Famille" by Giovanni Bellini, and a couple of portraits by Velasquez. We may mention that, according to the usual custom in loan exhibitions, the directors have felt it their duty to adopt without question the names and descriptions given by the owners; thus a *portrait d'homme* is entered under Antonello da Messina, although Messrs. Crowe and Cavalcaselle expressly say:—"This beautiful and delicate piece is not by Antonello, but by Andrea Solario." The same historians give credence to a picture of undoubtedly high quality—"The Virgin seated on a throne, holding the Infant on her knee"—in the collection of M. Reiset, which is ascribed to the rare painter Zaganelli da Cotignola. We notice that from Beekford's Fonthill collection comes an "Infant Christ," by Luini. On the whole, there is little sign in France of the archaeological tendencies—the reversion to early historic periods—which have so strongly prevailed in England, as exemplified in the National Gallery, and in the collections of Earl Dudley, Mr. Fuller Maitland, and the late Mr. Barker.

The Dutch masters are better represented than the Italian. Of first-rate quality is "Plage de Scheveningen," by Ruysdael, from the collection of the Duke of Aumale, and of no less merit are "Chevaux au pâturage," by Paul Potter, lent by Count Henri de Greffulhe, and "Paysage," by Wynants, formerly in the Galerie Delaessert. There are also two portraits by Antonio More, from the collection of the Countess Duchâtel, which are of an excellence that would be exceptional even in England. Likewise may be observed a few first-rate examples of Netscher, Van der Meer, and Van der Heyden. The works we have enumerated are on an equality with the pictures in the Peel collection.

But beyond doubt the strength of these Galleries lies in the never-to-be-forgotten collection of the French school, especially in what may be called its Orleans period, embracing Ingres, Horace Vernet, Delaroche, Delacroix, Decamps, Cogniet, Ary Scheffer, and others. Yet the history of the school is carried back to its earlier years in the time of Francis I. by an exquisite portrait of his Queen Claude from the pencil of the Court painter, François Clouet. The eighteenth century, that fanciful and frivolous epoch which shows itself supremely blatant in the Hertford collection, is here also conspicuous in Boucher, Watteau, Lancret, Fragonard, Pater, and Greuze, artists who show their best as well as their worst in a total of sixty-four works, of which no less than twenty-five come from the prolific and sensuous pencil of Greuze. "Reading the Bible," formerly in the Galerie Delaessert, is a favourable example of the soft sentimentality to which the artist could surrender himself when he affected to be serious or semi-

religious. The whole of this art was, like the social and political condition, false and far removed from nature. The art, in common with the surrounding structure, fell, and then followed the usual interregnum, or rather anarchy. Thus in these Galleries we read the chequered story of a nation's history.

The collection of portraits is in all points remarkable, sometimes in artistic worth, always for the sake of history. In every way worthy of attention are also the varied versions of Marie Antoinette, from the palmy days when, in the rapturous words of Edmund Burke, she lighted on this orb as a delightful vision, "glittering like the morning star, full of life, splendour, and joy," down to the hours of her imprisonment in the Temple. Amid all change the same face reigns supreme, proud and fascinating, even in humiliation and calamity. The Napoleon dynasty is permitted to assert itself through "Le roi de Rome," by Gérard; "Napoléon I^{er} le soir de Waterloo," by Charlet; "1814"—retreat in snow—by M. Meissonier; and a sketch for the famous "Apothéose de Napoléon I^{er}," by Ingres. The Orleans dynasty, the living representatives of which are leading promoters of the Exhibition, is kept unostentatiously in the background; the only portrait of the family which we can recall is that of the late Duke of Orleans, by Ingres, contributed by the Count of Paris. In these Galleries we find the retrospective record of the clear intellect, the sparkling wit, the beauty, and the grace which have ever shone in the French character. Here are portraits of François Arago and of Lamennais by Ary Scheffer, of Mme. de Staël and of Mlle. Récamier by Gérard. And from the remarkable "Collection de la Comédie Française" comes the portrait of Molière, in the character of Cæsar, by Mignard, while, among other theatrical celebrities, stand conspicuous Mlles. Georges, Mars, and Duchenois. It is evident that the French possess ample materials, both in point of subject and of art, for making a rich Historic Portrait Gallery.

We have seldom, if ever, seen a collection more honourable to that great epoch in the French school which, on the overthrow of David and the classicists, began with Géricault and ended with Delacroix and Delaroche. Here is a vigorous sketch in oils for Géricault's masterpiece in the Louvre, "The Wreck of the Medusa," a prodigy of dramatic power which annihilated cold classicism and fired the art of the half-century which followed with the action and passion of nature. The chief exceptions to the Romantic style, which thenceforth held sway, are found in the severity of Ingres and the pale placidity of Ary Scheffer—two honoured masters here seen at their best. Scarcely could we name since the days of Raffaele anything more mature in typical form or more exquisite in the flow of harmonious lines than the "Vénus Anadyomène" and the "Odalisque," by Ingres, and the nineteenth century cannot show anything more noble or grandly imaginative than Ary Scheffer's "Roi de Thule" and "Françoise de Rimini," both from the collection of Mme. Marjolin-Scheffer. Paul Delaroche, who occupies an intermediate place between the sober and stately Academic style on the one side, and the more lawless school of romance and of colour on the other, is seen to advantage in his historic character in "L'assassinat du duc de Guise," from the collection of the Duke of Aumale. Delaroche also had religious phases, especially at times when he threw the shadow of his melancholy over scenes of the Passion Week; there scarcely exist in Christian art works more true or pathetic than "L'évanouissement de la Vierge" and "Le retour du Golgotha"—both belonging to M. Delaroche-Vernet. The leader of the opposite party, Delacroix, the Titian, or rather the Rubens of Paris, who rushed in hot haste into a colour which confounded form, is fairly well seen in "Cléopâtre," and in a sketch for "L'entrée des Croisés à Constantinople"; the last belongs to the Duke of Aumale. But Decamps is the genius who asserts most power; we have not seen this supremely creative painter in equal versatility or originality since the International Exhibition in the Champs Elysées in 1857. Specially grand are the nine designs then, and here again, exhibited from the history of Samson; the figures might almost be from the hand of Michael Angelo, and the accessory landscapes by Salvator Rosa. It is but too evident whence M. Gustave Doré has taken some of his most thrilling thoughts. But Decamps did something better than revel in the riot of ungovernable fancy; by the fling of his hand, by the impetuous sweep of his pencil, by his range through boundless space, by the grandeur of his forms and the terror of his shadows, he brought into his wild creations the sense of the supernatural.

Among the miscellaneous collections the rarest treasures are eighteen specimens of Henri-Deux ware, a very large proportion of the total number of existing examples. Of these the Baroness de Rothschild lends a tazza of elegant form, Baron Gustave de Rothschild six pieces, some of which are of the finest possible quality, and Baron Alphonse de Rothschild seven specimens, of which the "biberon" is almost unexampled for size, design, and workmanship. It is instructive to observe how unequal in art merit are these eighteen examples of a manufacture which, notwithstanding much research, is still clouded in mystery; some are left absolutely unfinished, miniature cornices and other members being moulded simply in the mass; again, while certain specimens are almost faultless in the combination of architectural structure, of the figure and of surface decoration, others fall into a confused

hodge-podge. Differences may also be observed as to states of preservation; thus while a few specimens remain without chip or reparation, others show figures wanting heads or surfaces which have been painted over. It were vain to conjecture the number of thousands of pounds sterling which this almost unexampled assemblage would fetch, especially when we remember the sum at which Mr. Malcolm acquired perhaps the finest specimen we possess in England. The reconsideration which we have been able to give in Paris to this truly unique ware inclines to the conclusion that the extravagant prices now reached are scarcely in excess of its very exceptional art merit.

Another art fabric in which France stands supreme—that of enamel-work—is also here exemplified almost exhaustively. There are triptychs in champlevé as early as the twelfth century; also to the same period belong two remarkable figures of St. Paul and St. Thomas, richly decorated with enamel. The later and more pictorial styles of Limoges, the grey as well as the coloured, are represented by superb specimens; and it would indeed be sad if France had found herself denuded of art products of which she may be justly proud. Palissy were not so obtrusive as might have been feared, and we gladly encounter, instead of frogs, snails, and serpents, “*La nymphe de Fontainebleau sous les traits de Diane de Poitiers*”; the figure is here treated with a severity and command for which we had scarcely given Bernard Palissy credit. Tapestries, as might be expected in France, abound. Among many others we may mention a Gothic triptych of the fifteenth century, highly elaborated as an easel picture, and representing Christ crowned by the Virgin, with attendant angels and accessory fountains and flowers. The whole work is extremely beautiful. The art of illumination, in which France also takes a lead, finds an early commencement in the “*Évangélaire latin de l’abbaye de Luxeuil*”; *manuscrit du XI^e siècle, avec miniatures*—style rude Byzantine, colours pale on gold ground; also of great archaeological value are the “*Commentaires sur l’Apocalypse de San Beato*”; *manuscrit du XII^e siècle; école d’Aquitaine*”; the figures, on a blue ground, are lower in character than in the contemporaneous mosaics of Italy. Likewise as an important link in this Gallic school follows “*Une miniature sur vélin par Jean Fouquet*,” painter to Louis XI. How consummate was the art of Fouquet may be seen at Frankfurt in a private collection which no traveller should fail to visit.

With increased interest and appreciation we renewed acquaintance with the works of the deeply lamented Princess Mary of Orleans, who, though in some sense not more than an amateur, ranks, we incline to think, as the first female sculptor the world has yet seen. “*Jeanne d’Arc*,” “*Chasse au faucon*,” and “*l’Amazone au lévrier*,” all in bronze, are compositions which in any country and in any time would assert their title to a place in the first rank for originality in conception and mastery in treatment. The Orleanists have reason to be satisfied with the position which the present Exhibition gives them. It becomes apparent that around them gathered the best art talent of France.

REVIEWS.

STUBBS'S CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.*

IT is not without truth that Professor Stubbs begins his great task by saying that “the History of Institutions cannot be mastered—can scarcely be approached—without an effort.” To write his present volume must have been work in the truest and highest sense, and to read it is not exactly play. We sometimes see books advertised “for summer reading” or “for seaside reading,” formulae which always remind us of those Roman knights who had lighter rings for summer wear and heavier for winter. Those who draw a distinction between their summer and their winter reading will, we suspect, not venture upon Mr. Stubbs in the summer, if they even venture upon him at all. To the scholar his work will be equally welcome in summer or winter or any other season. Still to master such a thick-set mass of knowledge and thought does call for an effort. But Mr. Stubbs doubtless only writes for those who are ready to make an effort, and those who do make it will be rewarded by admission to such a storehouse of knowledge as has never been thrown open to Englishmen before.

Mr. Stubbs's work at once supplies us with an answer to the charge brought by Dr. Gneist against English scholars, that they do not attempt to grapple with their own constitutional history in any connected and scientific way, but treat it only piecemeal, in what he calls an antiquarian fashion. Here at last we have the thing done in a way as thorough and systematic as anything that any of Dr. Gneist's own countrymen could send forth. Mr. Stubbs has the same wide and close grasp of his subject which we see in the best German writers, and he may set Dr. Gneist a lesson in that minute accuracy of statement and reference which the Berlin Professor is very far from having reached himself. We would rather compare the native constitutional historian of England with the native constitutional historian of Germany. We have here a worthy companion-piece to the great *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte* of Waitz. Thus far Oxford and Göttingen may be content to walk together as equal yoke-fellows. It would be

painful to our insular feelings to carry the comparison further. The Worthies of All Souls would hardly, for their own sakes, wish to be matched against the continuation of Lappenberg and the monograph on Earl Simon. We have indeed the small comfort of thinking that the second Göttingen Professor does not belong to Göttingen only. If we must give up ten parts in Dr. Pauli to his own land, it is something that Oxford and Edinburgh may each fairly claim one part in him.

The work of Mr. Stubbs is the first Constitutional History of England, at once minute and continuous, which has been undertaken since a wholly new light has been thrown upon matters of this kind by the researches of the great German writers, Waitz, the two Maurers, and others. In his view, the growth of English institutions is not a mere isolated thing, something confined within the bounds of our own island, something for English antiquaries or English lawyers to make guesses at, without getting beyond their own narrow range. In his view, it is part of the great story of the development of Teutonic institutions. The further relations between Teutonic institutions and the institutions of other Aryan races he was perhaps, in a work strictly historical, hardly called on to enter upon at any length. It shows the millenniums through which we seem to have lived in point of historical insight within a very few generations, if we compare the fulness, the scientific precision, the wide comparative grasp, of the opening chapters of Mr. Stubbs's History with the childish talk of Blackstone or even with the meagreness of Hallam. It is no disrespect to those who doubtless did their best according to their light, to mark how very much more light has come among us within a very short time. Of course the time between Hallam and Stubbs is bridged over by two great writers; but the learning and genius of Sir Francis Palgrave were constantly warped by his strange and one-sided theories; and Mr. Kemble, who was the first to open to Englishmen the results of German scientific research, had no great gift of exposition; he deals with things in an unconnected kind of way, and after all his work covers only a few centuries at the beginning of our constitutional history. Mr. Stubbs, for the first time, gives us the unbroken history of our constitutional development, from the first notices of German institutions in Caesar down to the Great Charter of John. Of course at this time of day Mr. Stubbs does not stoop to argue that English institutions are Teutonic. There are others whose business it is to expose fictions; he has simply to deal with facts. But it is well to remember, what comes out most strongly in his opening chapter, that the political origin of institutions and the ethnological origin of the people among whom those institutions grow up are questions which are really quite distinct. Thus, in Mr. Stubbs's point of view, France and Spain are Teutonic countries hardly less than Germany and England. At first sight this seems startling because, from the point of view of language and from the point of view of blood, the Teutonic element in France and Spain is merely a small infusion. But Mr. Stubbs, from his point of view, is right in placing France and Spain in the Teutonic group, just as a philological writer is right in placing them in the Romance group, while a writer who dealt mainly with the actual races of men, and not with either their institutions or their languages, would be no less right in leaping over Romans and Teutons to get back to Celts and Iberians. The prevailing blood in France is undoubtedly Celtic; the language is Latin modified by the circumstances of a Teutonic conquest; but when we come to the political institutions and the consequent political history, the precedence of the elements is reversed. While we have a Latin language modified by Teutonic influences, we have a Teutonic polity modified by Latin and Gaulish influences, modified by the circumstances of a Teutonic settlement in a Gaulish province of Rome. Mr. Stubbs accordingly starts by classing together Germany, England, France, and Spain as the four countries where the history of Teutonic institutions under four different sets of circumstances has to be studied, and he does not scruple to fix upon England rather than Germany itself as the country where the original Teutonic elements have had the freest ground for growing into a national polity. In England the tendency has always been to unity, to the fusing together of the various kindred tribes and their kindred, but not identical, local institutions. In Germany, on the other hand, a number of causes, above all the annexation of the Crown of the Empire to that of the German kingdom, the “*Mezentian union with Italy*,” as Mr. Stubbs calls it, gave a less national character to the central monarchy, lessened its strength while exalting its dignity, and tended, not to fusion, but to separation among the several parts of the nation. In this way he traces out the chief points of difference as well as of likeness in the course which institutions that started from the same point have run in different countries. But, whether among those who tarried in the old land, among those who settled in the midst of conquered Roman provincials, or among those who made for themselves a new home by sweeping away all traces of the Roman and his subjects, the institutions of all alike spring from one common source, and to that source our present teacher traces them up in a way which must be perfectly clear to every one who has eyes to see anything at all. Never was the true Teutonic character of the English nation and its institutions more fully and clearly put forth than it is by Mr. Stubbs. Yet we could almost wish that he did not so often use the word “German” in a general sense. To most minds the word “German” conveys the meaning of something distinctively High-Dutch, and its use, as applied to anything English, always calls up a crowd of shallow objections from people who have not learned the difference between High and Low. Mr. Stubbs would probably answer that he writes, not for fools, but for

* *The Constitutional History of England in its Origin and Development.* By William Stubbs, M.A. Vol. I. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1874.

wise men, that he assumes that people have mastered obvious truths before they enter on that deeper research to which his volume is the best guide. Still it is always better to avoid giving any occasion for misconception, and it would also have been better if, in dealing with our earliest times, he had kept to the true name "English," which he uses almost alternately with the misleading "Anglo-Saxon." Nothing is plainer than that there is not a jot of confusion in Mr. Stubbs's own mind; but men of his class are sometimes tempted to forget that phrases which they can themselves use without confusion often lead to confusion in the minds of their readers; and that, though they may write for the wise only, their books often fall into the hands of those who are not wise.

The book is, in short, a masterpiece; it is the carrying out in minute detail of what the author had already traced out in the various sketches and summaries attached to the Select Charters. It is brimful of all the knowledge on the subject scientifically treated and orderly arranged. Yet it cannot be denied that it is stiff reading; it reads more like a German than an English book. That the stiffness is in the subject and not in the writer is plain to every one who remembers the easy flow of Mr. Stubbs's personal portraits in his various prefaces and of the commentaries on the Select Charters. It is the necessary result of cramming such a gigantic mass of thought and knowledge into so narrow a compass. We have heard it said, and with perfect truth, that Mr. Stubbs's book is not nearly so easy to read as Hallam's. The cause is obvious. Mr. Stubbs has about ten times as much to tell as Hallam had. And, during this part of his work, Mr. Stubbs has the great advantage of not being a lawyer; for at this stage it is an advantage, though at a later stage the gain is on the other side. We will not say that no lawyer can write early history, because there are men in every profession who can rise above the trammels of that profession; but, down at least to the reign of Edward the First, the technical lore of the lawyer is distinctly a hindrance. It is a hindrance, because it supplies the temptation, which only a very independent mind can overcome, to carry back existing rules and existing institutions to a time before their own date, and, instead of the facts of the case, to substitute a mass of arbitrary legal fictions. The two ideals of the mere lawyer are the king and the lord of the manor. Because the king and the lord of the manor have played a most important part for many ages, he carries them back into times when the lord had no existence at all, and when the king was quite another person from what he became in the days to which lawyers' notions apply. As long as any man has the notion in his head that there has been an hereditary king from all eternity, and an hereditary lord of the manor from a time only so far short of eternity as to allow the king time to make him a grant, the development or corruption of the institutions once common to the whole race can never be understood. What the lawyer, when he loses himself from his trammels, may rise to, we may see in Sir Henry Maine; but where he has a natural tendency to abide we may see in Mr. Finlason. The great point is fully to take in that both the king and the lord are both of them, we will not say ungodly men, but certainly men who have crept in unawares, and that the lord has crept in at a comparatively late time. The gradual changes by which the system which we see after the Norman Conquest was worked out of the older English institutions—that is, the common Teutonic institutions—the Norman Conquest itself bringing comparatively little that was absolutely new, but strengthening and hastening tendencies which were already at work, are now traced out in a way in which they have never been traced out before. No one has hitherto tried in the same systematic way to compare the institutions of the two periods, and to show the steps by which one changed into the other. On the growth of manors Mr. Stubbs has perhaps thrown as much light as can be thrown, but the thing is inherently obscure in itself. It is almost in the nature of things that it should be so, as the change from the free community to the lordship was the result, not of any legislative act, not of any one great event, but of a gradual process of whose stages no record was likely to be kept. But it is plain that here too the Norman Conquest only put the finishing stroke to a process which was already at work. The grants of *soc* and *soc* and the like, answering to the *emunitäten* of the German writers, gradually undermined the old local institutions, but in England at least they never wholly destroyed them. Notwithstanding all changes, the old local institutions went on growing into new forms and adapting themselves to new states of things. Meanwhile the royal power was strengthening, and the Norman kings brought in, not indeed a new constitution, but a new and more vigorous system of administration. The relation of the old and new elements to one another is set forth by Mr. Stubbs in a remarkable passage, one clause of which however might have been the better if some other word could have been found for "organism":—

The principle of amalgamating the two laws and nationalities by superimposing the better consolidated Norman superstructure on the better consolidated English substructure runs through the whole policy. The English system was strong in the cohesion of its lower organism, the association of individuals in the township, in the hundred, and in the shire; the Norman race was strong in its higher ranges, in the close relation to the Crown of the tenants in chief whom the king had enriched. On the other hand, the English system was weak in the higher organization, and the Normans in England had hardly any subordinate organization at all. The strongest elements of both were brought together.

What more than anything else distinguishes the newer system from the older is the fiscal spirit which reigns through the whole

Norman administration. The great aim and object of everything is to get money for the king. But while this led to a large amount of oppression, on the other hand it fostered the growth of an administrative system which might be used for other purposes, and it also called forth that spirit of resistance to oppressive demands which became the soul of later English freedom. All this Mr. Stubbs works out with wonderful care and minuteness. His former studies in the early Angevin reigns have made him better able to deal with this branch of his subject than any other man. Elsewhere he has given us living personal portraits of the men themselves; here he has discharged a far harder task, both of minutely tracing out their system of government, and showing what it sprang out of, and what it grew into. Some special points illustrating the way in which Mr. Stubbs deals with the great questions which his subject suggests we must keep for another notice.

A GENEVESE POET.*

AMONGST other results of modern centralization may be reckoned the gradual extinction of various minor literary capitals which flourished in provincial towns during the last century. Edinburgh in the days of Hume, Adam Smith, and Scott could often stand a comparison with London. Though perhaps it has not entirely lost its glory, the most distinguished Scotchmen of the present day have shown a disposition to leave their native country which would have startled even Johnson. The Universities and the Church induce some eminent writers to resist the general centripetal tendency; but London undoubtedly tends to attract to itself a larger proportion of talent in this as in most other professions. The same tendency naturally manifests itself in French literature. Geneva has been the birthplace of many eminent men and the dwelling-place of many others. It is enough to mention the names of Rousseau and Saussure to prove that in the eighteenth century the intellect of Geneva could influence France and the world. At the present day the glories of Calvin's city have become rather faded; and though Geneva has in more than one way an importance disproportionate to the numbers of its population, it can hardly be regarded as a great centre of literary activity. We have indeed seen a collection of poems by recent Genevese writers which shows that a certain fashion of verse-writing still survives, or was recently alive, though, to say the truth, the performers seem to deserve credit rather for a polite accomplishment than for much original genius. There are, however, two residents at Geneva whose reputation is of a higher order. One is M. Victor Cherbuliez, whose last novel, *Méla Holdemé*, was lately reviewed in these columns; and the other is M. Marc Monnier, a well-known political writer, who lives at Geneva, though we believe that he is by birth a Frenchman. He has recently published a rather ambitious poem, of which we shall presently speak; but he was previously known as the author of some very clever pieces of playful satire, to which it is not easy to find an exact parallel in English literature. We may perhaps say that, if *Dame Europa's School* had been written in witty verse, it might have passed for an imitation of M. Marc Monnier. Some of his comedies have been collected under the title of *Théâtre de Marionnettes*; they are, in fact, in the form of plays, but such as, if we could suppose them to be acted upon any stage, would be most suitable to a company of puppets. The form, however, is merely chosen as the most convenient vehicle for light, though often telling, satire upon contemporary politics. The motto prefixed to his last performance, which refers to the German war, is sufficiently significant:—

Le Français a l'esprit moqueur
Même quand il n'est pas en fête,
Et vaincu, se rit du vainqueur,
Qui sera toujours le plus bête.

Upon M. Marc Monnier has fallen some corner of the mantle of his great neighbour Voltaire, who would have fully appreciated and heartily enjoyed some of the strokes of wit aimed at the successor of the great Frederick. The satire, indeed, was sufficiently keen to excite the susceptibility of French officials. In a piece published in 1865 one of the speakers proclaims an Encyclical; he announces

Que le froc a des parfums d'ambre,
Que le printemps vient en décembre,
Que la paix règne entre les rois;
Enfin que deux et deux font trois;

and adds, that if anybody chooses to say on the contrary,

Que le froc sent mauvais parfois,
Que décembre est un vilain mois,

or that two and two make four, he will be sent, as the Pope in the *Ingoldsby Legends* expresses it, "where good manners won't let me tell." An unlucky writer quoted these lines in a French newspaper, and was punished by a fine of a thousand francs and imprisonment for three months.

The authorities under the Imperial Government held that a disagreeable allusion was concealed in the reference to December. We have a natural objection in England to such modes of restraining the liberty of the press, but we may allow that they have one advantage. Satire which has to evade such scrutiny must be very dexterously smuggled into verse; and though M. Marc

* *Théâtre de Marionnettes*. Par Marc Monnier. Geneva: 1871.
Vie de Jésus: racontée en vers français. Par Marc Monnier. Paris: 1874.

Monnier has the advantage of living at Geneva, he has that delicacy in the use of his weapons which has been fostered amongst Frenchmen by constant practice in "saying everything where nothing is allowed to be said." His touch is light; and though his meaning is generally clear enough, he can be cutting without being brutal, and has the air of being most playful when he is saying the most serious things. In short, he has that happy French art which is most wanting in our rough English satire, and which it is scarcely possible to describe adequately without using words borrowed from the French themselves. We can feel the difference between "chaff" and persiflage; or between the faculty which we describe when we say that a writer is witty and that which is implied by the epithet *spirituel*. If we did not recognize the difference, M. Marc Monnier, as compared with any ordinary English political satirist, would supply an excellent illustration of its meaning. We may, however, best give some notion of his writing by taking one of his most recent performances, the meaning of which requires no Daniel as an interpreter. It is a new version of *Faust*, which opens with a parody of the familiar scene in heaven. Mephistopheles appears before Providence, who has been allowing the world to get into considerable disorder, and makes a bet that he will seduce Faust in three days. Faust is a good German, much in the habit of praying to Providence, and with a fine collection of sticks, whips, canes, and clubs ready for use in a good cause. Mephistopheles introduces himself according to precedent, and induces Faust and his friend Kaiserlich to attack poor Hamlet the Dane, who has become a very peaceable, quiet person since Shakespeare's time. Malbrouc looks out of his window and remarks to Sabredebois that a row is taking place. "Je crois," says Sabredebois, at his door—

Je crois qu'on dévalise Hamlet.

MALBROUC.

Ils sont deux contre un, les Vandales.

SABREDEBOIS.

Et lui soutirent les sandales.

MALBROUC.

Pour châtier ces deux poltrons—

SABREDEBOIS.

Corbleu!

MALBROUC.

Rentrons chez nous!

SABREDEBOIS.

Rentrons! (*Ils rentrent.*)

We need not describe at length how Mephistopheles presently makes friends with the Italian Machiavelli; how the two together fall upon poor Kaiserlich and strip him; how Mephistopheles contrives to humbug Sabredebois into looking on without interference, and afterwards tricks him into insulting Faust. Mephistopheles has a very simple system; he always plays with his cards on the table, and announces his worst plans beforehand:—

Quand j'ai quelque infamie à faire,
Je l'annonce à chaque hémisphère;
Les badauds, pensant que je mens,
Ne gênent pas mes mouvements;
C'est ainsi que je les dépouille,
Et quand plus tard ils chantent pouille,
Je leur réponds: Mes bons amis,
Ne vous l'avais-je pas promis?

Finally, Sabredebois is thoroughly beaten, and Marguerite, an innocent peasant girl, who lives, we should suppose, somewhere near the Rhine, is carried off by Faust. Malbrouc contents himself with a modest protest; Mephistopheles argues that he has won his wager and made out Faust a robber, murderer, and ravisher. Providence asks Faust to which power he belongs, and Faust humbly replies, "Je suis à toi, ma Providence!" Mephistopheles concludes, "Maintenant tirez le rideau!" and the little play concludes for the present. The puppets have said their say smartly enough; and even people who take a rather different view of the true character of Mephistopheles, Faust, and Sabredebois, may admit that they have interpreted the French view of recent history with abundant ingenuity and epigrammatic vigour.

The series of Marionette comedies goes as far back as the American war; and we may presume that M. Marc Monnier's adherence to this method of uttering his feelings shows that it is natural to him, and has been appreciated by his readers. The other poem to which we have referred is as odd a contrast as can well be imagined; but French gallantry is equal to anything. The author of a *Théâtre de Marionnettes* might be supposed to be an ingrained satirist, and to be likely to take the cynical view of most subjects of human thought. We might naturally fear that one who inherits so much of the Voltaire spirit would treat the *Vie de Jésus* in a manner not precisely edifying to ordinary Englishmen. The very notion of transferring the Gospels into French verse has something rather startling to our minds; and M. Marc Monnier's antecedents would scarcely suggest that he was the fittest man for the task. We cannot, indeed, conscientiously say that the book is likely to be an edifying one to English readers. For most purposes, we may venture to say, we prefer to read the original documents or the most literal translation obtainable. Some writers have obviously been under the impression that they could materially improve upon the originals. We have more than once had the misfortune of reading sermons and treatises in which the simple language of the Gospels has been overlaid with a mass of rhetorical verbiage which to our minds has been simply disgusting. Milton has of course given a precedent for expanding hints given in the Scriptures into magnificent poetry. Whether

Milton would have chosen such a theme if he had lived at the present day is a question which would admit of some argument; but at least we should be induced to say that nobody ought to do it who is not conscious that he is a worthy rival of Milton's, without deciding whether, even in that case, he might not employ his genius for a better purpose. At any rate we must confess that M. Marc Monnier's performance is only noticeable by us as a literary curiosity. There is indeed no sign of intentional irreverence in his writing. He has altered the text as little as possible; most of his poetry is simply taken from the words of the original, altered as little as is compatible with presenting them in a French dress. Everybody who has been brought up under the influence of the English regard for even the letter of the Bible is probably conscious of a slight, and of course utterly irrational, shock when he reads for the first time even a literal prose translation of the Gospels into a modern foreign language. He has associations with words which sometimes strike him rather oddly when used in a sacred connexion. Of course a little reflection dissipates the sense of incongruity in this case; but it does not vanish quite so quickly when he sees the familiar phrases forced into the French heroic metre, especially if he has shared the ordinary English distaste for most French poetry. The difficulty of fairly criticizing the work of M. Marc Monnier is therefore so great that we must decline the task; and will simply leave our readers to judge for themselves from a fragment, which we select because it is short, and because there is nothing in it which can jar unnecessarily upon even an unreasoning instinct of reverence. Here is a version of a few verses:—

Les disciples parfois avaient l'âme jalouse.
Comme chez eux plus d'un se croyait le plus grand,
Et qu'ils se disputaient entre eux le premier rang,
Jésus prit un enfant qu'il mit entre les douze:
"Voilà ceux," leur dit-il, "que j'aime et je défends;
Le royaume du ciel est à qui leur ressemble.
Hommes, soyez comme eux. Laissez venir ensemble,
Laissez venir à moi les plus petits enfants!"

If anybody likes to read the Gospels in this form, he may find them all done into beautifully printed and fluent verse in M. Marc Monnier's version.

THE COUNT OF PARIS'S HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN WAR.*

(Second Notice.)

IN a former notice we have given unqualified praise to that preliminary part of this work which undertakes to trace the growth of the American army of 1861-65 from its early germs in the provincial militia battalions that fought so gallantly in the Seven Years' War. As we then pointed out, it has been a great deal too much the fashion in Europe to treat the levies which served the cause of the Union as though they were some perfectly new creation, instead of being but a revival on a grand scale of the volunteer forces of former American contests. In truth, the system which produced the hardy troops who aided the British regulars to wrest the dominion of North America from the French, and who not long after drove the same regulars from point after point until they lost all hold on the Thirteen Colonies, was not dead during long terms of peace, but merely slumbering. The same free, active, adventurous spirit was forthcoming at the later crisis as in the earlier. No doubt it was burlesqued by the coarse "loafers" of the Atlantic cities, who showed all the rudeness of the early settler without his virtues. But, viewed as a mass, the raw material was almost as tough in the days of Bull Run, panics notwithstanding, as in those of Brandywine, and, with all the faults that were so prominent to the professional observer, it had by instinct an individual power and readiness which, under certain circumstances, and on its own ground, would have made it more formidable than the best-trained soldiers of Europe. The fact that this was so, and the reasons why it was so, are themes that have never been thoroughly handled before the Count of Paris undertook them, and there is not a word to be said against his execution of this part of his great task.

But it would have been well, we are bound to say, if he had confined himself to the purely military treatment of his subject; for the philosophic breadth with which he reviews American warfare suddenly vanishes when he comes to the more difficult subject of American politics. In one of his introductory chapters, "L'Esclavage," he undertakes to do for the origin of the great struggle what he had previously done for that of the Union army that engaged in it; and the very title shows that he approaches the subject with such a prejudiced view that his judgment is no longer to be trusted. Of course any writer has an easy task who undertakes to prove that the dreadful contest of 1861 would not have broken out when it did, nor the combatants have been spurred with the same fierceness of passion, had not the slave-holding States risen against the Union avowedly to maintain their cherished institution. But when this is said, and when the features of a slave-holding Republic, confessedly to be maintained as such, are painted in the darkest colours and denounced in the best set terms, the whole difficulty is by no means disposed of. The historian who would really exhaust the question must go back to the foundation of the Union. He must not only ask, but answer, such questions as—

* *Histoire de la guerre civile en Amérique*. Par M. le Comte de Paris, ancien aide-de-camp du général MacClellan. Tomes 1 et 2. Paris: Lévy. 1874.

Who was it that could have prevented this struggle coming on in course of time? Where is the exact point to be fixed at which the victorious Virginian patriot who owned slaves under Jefferson became the enemy of mankind for adhering to the system of slavery in the days of Lincoln? Whose fault was it that the founders of the Union evaded the settlement of the question which afterwards grew into violent disruption, and even prepared the way for this disruption by leaving the right to secede a subject untouched by the Constitution? The fact is that to any one who views the history of the United States down to 1860, apart from any preconceived views on the subject of slavery or of secession, it is sufficiently apparent that the former, once suffered legally to grow within a section, must inevitably at some time or other have led to the latter, and that the right to secede in order to protect her property and her hitherto recognized rights was one which could only be disproved to the South by the arbitrament of the sword, in default of any power sufficiently wise and despotic to settle the matter peaceably. But to see this, and to say it plainly, is neither to condemn nor to justify slavery in the abstract. It is simply to assert that the Union was originally imposed by circumstances on such diverse elements as could not be for ever retained together by any peaceable means. In view of the interests of humanity the solution brought by the war may have been a just and happy one; but, as regards the contending parties, there could really be no more guilt on the one side than on the other, since each was but doing that which the conditions imposed on it by inheritance compelled it to do. We have gone out of our way to say this, because the declarations of the Count of Paris in his slavery chapter add not one word of novelty to the stock Union arguments framed after Union had become identified with Abolition. And he ignores the broad fact that President Lincoln himself, though elected to serve anti-slavery purposes, declared over and over again, long after the war was fairly begun, that it was waged for Union and not for Abolition; in other words, the crime of the slaveholders was not that they were what their ancestry and laws had made them, but that, being slaveholders, they revolted against a Government which was framed originally to protect all the inner economy of every member of the Union, but was gradually becoming, as they had cause to fear, more and more one-sided against the South, and more and more able to give weight to its partiality.

We are sorry to be compelled to go on and observe that the Count's political feelings on this subject have influenced his treatment of that part of his military matter which deals with the framework of the Confederate army. Thus we find him making it a sort of crime on the part of the Southerners that the minority amongst them who dreaded parting from the banner of the Union were reduced to silence by the violence of the dominant party. No doubt they were. But it is certainly not less matter of history, to put it mildly, that New York mobs brought over the reluctant members of the press in that city to the Union side by a kind of pressure not a whit more constitutional than the revolutionary Committees which the Count (on very doubtful authority, as we think) builds up all over the South to carry on the process of political conversion. Here again, so far as the facts are really ascertained, each side pursued the same end with whatever means came to hand. Nations cannot make war effectively whilst parties within them denounce the whole proceeding as an iniquity, and they instinctively discover this as soon as the work is seriously entered on. We know no authority higher than that of the secondhand gossip of the *Tribune* for such stories as the Count gives of Unionists in the South condemned to instant death, "round the bar on which gin and whisky were flowing, whilst violent men held judgment on their fellow-citizens." But we do know it for certain that a journal of New York in the April of that strange year, 1861, was praising the efforts made by the Charleston patriots to take Fort Sumter, and within three months later was thundering against the "Rebs" with all the zeal of a neophyte. Such conversions are too common in every revolution, and a philosophic writer is bound to explain rather than to condemn them, much less to suppose them limited to one party in a civil struggle.

But we must pass to the more strictly military part of this history, where we are able to speak with more pleasure of the author's labours. We purposely select that portion of which he was an eye-witness. Excellent is his account of the reorganization—if that can so be called which dealt with what hardly knew any organization before—of the beaten army of the North under MacClellan after Bull Run. A graphic yet truthful picture is here given of the immense difficulties which the new chief encountered at every turn, and more especially of the rude condition of the levies placed under his charge with what, according to European judgment, would have been utterly inadequate powers of military control. The difficulties met with in the ignorance and inexperience of his volunteer officers, the means taken to purge this body of its most incompetent members, and the despair of the rejected, "for besides the dishonour, it was a heavy pecuniary loss to them," are all admirably told. Indeed this whole chapter, "*Les Préparatifs de Combat*," can be studied in every page with both pleasure and profit. That the young Commander-in-Chief was able to do anything at all with such raw material is very justly explained as owing to a cause which has hitherto been little recognized on this side of the Atlantic—namely, to the high moral calibre of the men enlisted.

On the other hand [it is said, after reciting the difficulties] the intelligence and education which placed the greater part of the rank and file on a level

with their military superiors inspired them with a natural respect for those of their chiefs in whom they recognized the necessary qualities for commanding them, and caused them to accept without a murmur the obligations and restraints of a military life as soon as they were got to understand their necessity. Leaving to a few regiments, composed for the most part of European adventurers, the monopoly of insubordination, they had none of that turbulence which is often associated with the name of volunteer. A few warnings were sufficient to remind them that, the oath once taken, there were to be no more amateurs with the colours.

And our author goes on to narrate in detail the single instance which occurred of open resistance to MacClellan's authority. This took place in the streets of Washington itself, and was easily suppressed by a slight show of some regular troops that were at hand, the disobedient regiment promptly returning to its duty, and showing thereafter the most earnest desire to win back the flag which it had forfeited in its disgrace.

The Count was present during this whole period of preparation and apparent inaction, for he joined the army not long after its misfortune at Bull Run. His first volume closes at this point, and the second will be a disappointment to those who look to find in it the story of that particular campaign of MacClellan's in which he personally shared. It is devoted to other early portions of the war. The last chapter, however, under the title of "*Hampton Roads*," treats of the final preparations for the great undertaking, and the difficulties which the General-in-Chief met with at the hands of the President in his design of carrying his army away from the vicinity of Washington by water, in order to attack Richmond the more easily. The plan of MacClellan in its details was ably conceived, as it is here very ably drawn. He would have left Washington protected by 22,000 recruits covered by the new works. Near it were to be 30,000 troops under Banks and the German general Blenker, half of whom were told off to guard the approach down to Shenandoah Valley, whilst the rest might be posted at Manassas, with the Washington works and garrison in second line. This was more, it is properly observed, than was required to protect the capital for the moment, until the coming danger of Richmond should draw the main Confederate army that way, when MacClellan had even proposed to detach Blenker's division into Western Virginia. With his own Army of the Potomac he was preparing to force his way up the Yorktown peninsula to the east side of the capital of the South. Finally, the reserve corps of MacDowell, containing 38,000 of the best trained of the volunteers, was to be moved suddenly in transports after MacClellan had actually fixed the attention of the defenders of Richmond, to turn the works which he would have before him.

The accomplishment of the task assigned to this corps was, in the eyes of General MacClellan, indispensable to insure rapid success in the campaign. But at the very moment that he was about to embark MacDowell received from the President the order to remain in the neighbourhood of Washington, and a laconic despatch told MacClellan that the troops he awaited so impatiently were withdrawn from his command. Since the operations had begun he was deprived of nearly a third of the army he had formed with such pains, and to the good organization of which he had sacrificed a part of his popularity. . . . It will be seen in the succeeding volume how dearly this fault was paid for.

With these words the Count closes the present instalment of his work, and prepares us to look with interest for its continuation. Of its merits as a military history we have already said much, and few readers will be found to dispute them. If there be any such, they will probably be persons who have as strong political prepossessions on the American question as the author himself, but who give their personal sympathy to the lost cause as warmly as his is bestowed on that of the victorious Union.

JOHNSON ON LANDSCAPE GARDENING.*

THIS book would be more useful if it were briefer and clearer as well as less didactic and theoretical. We have no doubt that its author would make less ado about pricking out a garden plan or levelling the side of a hillock than about constructing a sentence, or at any rate writing half a page. Feeling a high sense of the responsibility of authorship, he must needs consult the dignity and depth of his subject rather than the leisure of practical readers, and, having read Mr. Ruskin with individual profit, he is led to retail Ruskinism without its force. The result is naturally surplussage and vagueness, for hints on style and taste and arrangement repeat themselves with cumbrous solemnity, and a good many pages are taken up with dissertations on the beautiful and on love. But it is worth while occasionally to encounter all this for the sake of the valuable matter that lies beneath, and we can make allowance for unconscious haziness on paper in one who understands his art and can realize his ideas in practice. If we allow for this weakness, and for that other which seems common to the class of professional landscape-gardeners—namely, the conviction that an amateur cannot possibly do right or avoid ruinous mistakes if he follows the dictates of his own taste, or admits the suggestions of his own unaided eye—there will be found enough of sound truth and useful hints in Mr. Johnson's hundred and fifty pages to interest the curious and instruct the doubtful horticulturist.

We shall confine our remarks to the most practical chapters of the three books which make up the volume, and which discuss respectively beauty, laws of order, and principal effects and styles

* *The Natural Principles of Landscape Gardening.* By Joseph Forsyth Johnson, Curator of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Belfast. Printed for the Author by Archer & Sons, Belfast. 1874.

of scenery. In Ch. II. of the first book a good deal may be learned on the topic of "line and colour" which will stand the amateur in stead when he is planning the decoration of his beds. With trees, shrubs, and lower growths in the shape of carpeting plants and the like, colours, tints, and shades have to be considered with a view to happy arrangement. The rule given in p. 21 is not to be controverted, that not more than two primary colours should be resorted to for the decoration of beds, and of these colours scarlet and yellow are better for boundaries to a centre than for the centre itself. Blue is perhaps the best master colour for every scene, and experience justifies Mr. Johnson's caution against the abuse and profusion of yellow. A little goes a long way in golden foliage, as may be seen by any one who, after a surfeit of yellow calceolarias in a bed-centre, falls back upon "gold-chain geraniums" in their place, and finds the change an excellent one. In reds and yellows nature furnishes a rich choice of flower, fruit, and foliage. Both deciduous trees and many of the conifers and other evergreens supply rich golden effects in the aspect of their foliage; and as to reds, the Red Dogwood and suchlike trees in their bark, the scarlet thorns and chestnuts in their flower, the American oak, English elm, and common beech in their leaves, and a host of evergreen and deciduous shrubs in their berries, furnish a succession and variety of these all the year through. Mr. Johnson endeavours to teach us how to blend, compare, and contrast these, and in so doing he maintains that "yellow seems to approach the eye, red to retain its position, blue to retire; dark shades to give depth, and light ones elevation." Perhaps we may judge of his other postulates by the last, and no one will dispute the importance of light shades to impart height, and to contribute to distant effects.

Carrying these principles into the second book, the author applies them with effect in his chapters on Lines of Sight, Lines of Distance, and so forth, as well as to the decoration of given spaces with the three grades of vegetable growth—carpet-plants, shrubs, and trees. His problem is so to occupy a given site that its charm shall not be fitful, its outlooks not fewer than nature gave or art can contrive, its facilities of enjoyment not curtailed either by blundering obstructions or by indifference to palpable rules and laws of beauty. Thus, in the first place, he would plant for future as well as for present effect, and to this end would blend the bedding-out system with an arrangement of herbaceous subjects and evergreen shrubs with an eye to permanence. The space between the back outlines and the foreground of a landscape he would allot to growths of summer display, the outlines themselves to plants that may charm even in the winter. It is obvious that among the latter the Rhododendron, Ilex, Arbutus, Berberis, with other and smaller growths, will be prominent by way of basis to their attractions, but the tables of special effects of trees and shrubs given at pp. 94-5 will perhaps be more suggestive of hints to the reader than the somewhat more technical plans with which the work is illustrated. We sympathize with Mr. Johnson in his crusade against the mixed dotting system, and in his plea for harmony of arrangement. Though we hardly think he need have cautioned readers of sufficient cultivation to open a book on landscape gardening against putting scarlet geraniums in a "rosetum," we commend him for the hint that such vegetable forms as ivies, hollies, and rhododendrons are best grouped with their own varieties, for purposes of comparison rather than of contrast. So with carpeting plants, woolly plants, minute-leaved, succulent, and trailing plants; though it is not objectionable to mass with each other subjects of similar habit—e.g. Pentstemon with Antirrhinum, or Primulas, Alyssums, Gentiana acaulis, Campanula, and Lobelia fulgens. To revert for a moment to the rose-bed, it is a good hint of Mr. Johnson's, towards the end of his volume, that it may be advantageously interspersed with plants of the Acer negundo or the Spiræa Lindleyana, which will both enhance the beauty of the roses when in bloom, and furnish a pleasing object to fall back upon at other times—to say nothing of the value of the Acer negundo as a foliage plant, and of the Spiræa for bouquets.

In considering his materials for covering the lawn or garden space effectively, our author lays down the law that shrubs should be arranged, "firstly, according to their masses, and, secondly, in accordance with their outlines," whilst with trees, on the other hand, it is just *vice versa*. In illustration of the former position he cites the rich character of grounds planted with rhododendrons:—

The effect of their undulations and foliage-massing and outlines, loaded with brilliant flowers, may be much enhanced by borrowing hues of silver and gold from other plants, more especially at the season when rhododendron flowers are scarce. Their masses of rounded foliage gain much by being contrasted with growths of columnar and horizontal form.

We may here observe that there is no real discrepancy between this remark and one to which we have already referred about massing rhododendrons, ivies, &c., with their own varieties, because in the latter case it would seem to be the effects of outline in particular trees and larger shrubs that are contemplated by the author. In the same sense he dilates, further on, upon the fitness of rhododendrons as supplying a basis for effects of larger growths of vegetation, and a point of union between these and plants in the middle line of sight. "The Rhododendron," he adds, "is beautiful when employed to realize a leading effect in scenery, particularly when surrounded by vegetation of a darker shade than its own, such for instance as is witnessed in many species of the fir tribe." How sound his views are on the matter of allowing room and space for shrubs and trees may be seen in the rare beauty of even so everyday a tree as the larch, when it

has been thus liberally treated. Instead of displaying a bare trunk and limbless sides, its draped and pendulous lateral branches kiss the very ground with their fringes. In his interesting pages on the different characters of trees our author pleads for full room for the grand tribe of Picas to develop in; and he maintains that, when so treated, either singly or in a judicious group, upon a suitable site, they are as worthy of admiration as even the chestnut avenue in Bushy Park. Among evergreens he has a great leaning to the Cedar of Lebanon, for which he rightly deems the Cedrus Atlantica, in its light, bright hues, a poor exchange. It certainly has not the same grand and sombre effect in giving unity to scenery, or enhancing the façade of buildings. The Picas he would rightly relegate to a greater distance, and then he would not suffer them to be arranged in avenues, for which deciduous trees suit better. Certainly modern experiments in this direction incline us to agree with him, though we cannot shut our eyes to existing fine effects in avenues of Scotch firs, planted, according to tradition, in tacit proof of the attachment of the planters to the cause of the exiled Stuarts. As if to meet the landscape-gardener's demand for permanency of agreeable form and foliage, the conifers, as is shown in Mr. Johnson's second book, may be used with good effect in cases where spiral, pyramidal, columnar, tabular, or pendulous habit, as well as hues and shades of green and gold, sea-green, grass-green, and silver, are required for the necessities of landscape beauty. It is impossible to glance at the descriptions here given of the various deciduous trees, their qualifications, and their fitting localizations. We must, however, heartily endorse Mr. Johnson's wish "that a name should impart something of the character of species, as with the Populus fastigiata, or columnar poplar, reminding us of their beauty and, if it might be, economic uses." Something, he thinks, might be done by the Royal Horticultural Society to promote the correct terminology of plants, both in books and in public parks and gardens. We may remind him that a meritorious step in this direction has been taken, some years ago, in the Victoria Park at Bath, where every tree and shrub is carefully labelled, and the same practice prevails more or less in the London Parks. We should like to see it extended to our provincial arboreta. It takes some little education in arboriculture to appreciate such abnormal facts in tree-life as the instance which Mr. Johnson quotes of the Quercus ilex becoming deciduous in the winter of 1870-1; of a distinctly pendulous Thuja borealis at Castle Leslie, and a perfectly pyramidal Taxus baccata at Hillsborough, which last had not been so shaped by the knife. Nor is it, we suspect, generally known that the common yew will grow and flourish on the roots of other trees, even of the elm and the beech, and, instead of striking out aloft, will carpet the ground for many years.

We have as yet said nothing of the author's views as to laying out the ground which he purposes to cover with shrubs and trees. It is in truth here that we can only partially follow him. Though he honestly discourages such *tours de force* as removing mountains and introducing lakes without consideration of the natural features of the situation, we think he unnecessarily multiplies his heads of arrangement when he discusses "General Effects, Recesses, Grouping, Promontories, Avenues, Extents, Expanses, Intermediate Scenes, Leading Objects, Artificial Work, Bowers, Rests," &c. Some of these heads are far too technical for general application, and we should tremble for the result of a development of ground *secundum artem* to this extent. Undoubtedly in undulating ground, or ground which can easily be rendered undulating, sites of depression will admit of their own special effects, and sites of elevation of theirs likewise. Mr. Johnson calls the former *Recesses*, dividing them into the Flower-garden, the Rockery, the Rosery, and the Wilderness; and the latter he calls *Promontories*, which aid in harmonizing scenery, and furnish centres and outlooks surmounted and diversified by striking tree-forms. It does not appear with which of these divisions the bowers are to be associated. The flowering ash, Robinia, and weeping birch might point to a promontory, but the Clematis, of which, along with a variety of more delicate and fragile climbers, we should prefer to weave our bower, would seem better adapted for the shelter of a recess. A good list of such climbers is given in p. 136, with honourable mention of Mr. Jackman's success in the development of the Clematis. To the arrangement designated *Rest*, p. 103, we looked in the vain hope of discovering something new in garden seats—at the very least a new edition of the "vivo sedilia saxo" of Virgil and Ovid; but a glance showed us that "ivies, vincas, and evergreen shrubs" were accessories which did not promise "repose" in the sense we had fondly imagined, at all events not repose undisturbed by insects and slugs. Mr. Johnson makes much, but not too much, of water-effects, where they can be had, and he ventures on a mild joke when he remarks that "rooteries are sometimes substituted for rockeries."

When we arrive at the third part of the author's subject—our remarks on which must be crowded into two or three sentences—we seem to tread familiar ground. Scenery, we are taught, has two divisions—natural and artificial effects, the latter being associated with buildings, the former with land. It is here that the relation of park and garden to a mansion becomes alike interesting and instructive. We are taught how to lay out the interval between art and nature, between the house and the ha-ha; and between the precincts within the range of a sunk fence and the natural undulations beyond it. The Irish juniper, for instance, in its columnar growth harmonizes best with the former, the Pinus excelsa with the more far-away slopes. "Wild scenery ought not to come too close to our doors, nor the waving and sometimes rugged outlines

of the forest prove the limitaries of great mansions. It is well to have some intermediate character of lines to give union, e.g. the Cedrus Libani in all its natural majesty will not, when in contiguity, prove incongruous." Hints such as these show a practical grasp of the subject to which Mr. Johnson's literary power scarcely does justice; and the same remark applies to his ideas about roads, public and private, avenues, walks, and the like. Still, whatever may be the defects of literary style, his work is quite worth a careful perusal, and we have only to wish that its bulk were reduced by two-thirds, which it easily might be if the author would confine himself to practical matter.

FREEMAN'S COMPARATIVE POLITICS.*

THE difficulty of finding a name seems likely to press with increasing weight on the discoverers or propounders of new sciences. The science which concerns itself with the growth or structure of any given language received without much hesitation the title of philology; when the field of research was extended to all the languages with which it might have any affinity, comparative philology was readily suggested as a fitting name for the science in this its wider application. In the same fashion, mythology, which brings together and scrutinizes the epical or popular stories of a single people became comparative when these stories were examined side by side with the traditions of tribes which might or might not be of kin to that people. It is not less obvious that, if any two or more tribes have a common language and common epical traditions, and if these traditions betray an indefinite agreement in thought, manners, and habits, they may have like correspondences in their political growth, and thus in their modes of making and administering law. It is even more likely that they will resemble each other in matters which seem in priority of order to have preceded the formation of any definite political ideas—in other words, that they will exhibit points of likeness in religious thought. The method which seeks to determine and arrange the points of likeness and difference under these two heads deserves the name of a science not less than that which concerns itself with the speech or the myths of any given tribe or people. But at present no better name has been hit upon for the one than the Science of Religion, while for the other Mr. Freeman contents himself with the title of Comparative Politics, and would prefer to retain his science without a name rather than that it should be labelled "Sociology."

If any persons choose to lay stress on this lack of a satisfactory name, we have no intention of following in their steps. Still less do we care to determine whether, in upholding the claims of a new science, or of a science supposed to be new, Mr. Freeman has said things which he or others have said already. We do not even care to treat the existence of the science of comparative politics as a subject for discussion. We will assume it to be fully proved; and at this time of day we may surely do so without fearing to be accused of going too far or of unlawful exaggeration. For those who know what is meant by the term race, and who therefore know what is meant by the distinction which separates Aryan from Semitic or Turanian tribes, there can be no need to say that if Aryan tribes resemble each other, to whatever degree, in their speech and in their forms of religious and philosophical thought, they will resemble each other also in their popular usages and in their methods of making and administering law. The three things will hang together, and the real question will be to ascertain the circumstances which have determined not so much the points of likeness as the points of difference, and to measure the degrees of evidence which may in each case justify a positive or a negative conclusion. That Mr. Freeman's position, so far as he states it, is fully borne out by fact, we have no thought of disputing; but this may be said of many, perhaps most, of the conclusions of Niebuhr, Arnold, Thirlwall, and Grote; and it seems clear that we cannot expect to get rid of difficulties until we have fairly sought to ascertain whether any given matters assigned as causes for a particular state of things are not rather to be regarded as effects of a previous cause, the knowledge of which is really needed to explain the seeming mystery.

It becomes, therefore, a matter of the first importance to determine the measure of confidence which we may place respectively in the three sciences of comparative philology, mythology, and politics, even if we say nothing of the comparative science of religion. We have heard much of the wonders achieved by the first of these sciences, which in Mr. Freeman's eyes seems invested with more of the attribute of infallibility than we should choose to assign to it. Exceptions to Grimm's Law are by no means altogether lacking; nor is it as yet conclusively proved that, even if the radically distinct origin of the great branches of human speech be granted, the analogy of sound which suggested a root for the one might not suggest the same root for the other. Mr. Freeman thinks that there is at least room for the belief that the simple stories and easily imagined situations "which form the staple of the legendary lore of most nations, may have been invented over and over again in distant times and places"; but he seems to regard it as inconceivable

that, although the grinding of corn may have been frequently hit upon, those who discovered it "should all have called the instrument of grinding a mill." If the word *all* be struck out, we see no insurmountable difficulty in believing that the sound made by the rubbing of stones together may have suggested to many tribes the root MR or ML, and that a certain likeness should be traced even among the derivatives from these roots in their several dialects. His own position is probably weakened by the jealousy with which he reserves to the science of philology the final verdict in deciding the identity or diversity of popular myths. If the names in two or more given stories of which the incidents are alike be philologically the same, they come from a common source; and so there can be no doubt about tales in which Helios, Selene, Asterodia, and Hersé are the actors. But the same confidence cannot be felt where this clue of language is lacking; it cannot even be felt in all cases where it is found. The etymological connexion between the Charis of the Iliad, the Charites of the Odyssey, and the Vedic Harits cannot, Mr. Freeman holds, be disputed; but he also regards the opinion "that they took their name from the noun *χάρις*, in the later and ordinary sense of the word, after that later and ordinary sense had parted off from the original root," as not untenable. It is, we think, to say the least, to the last degree unlikely. That Até and the Litai are direct impersonations from the later sense of the words is extremely doubtful; and although there seem to be some manifest impersonations in the Hesiodic theogony, as of the Long Hills, these impersonations have no office. The Charites wrap Phoibos in the pure white robe at his birth, and anoint Aphrodite with the glistening oil. It is almost impossible to believe that beings invented from a word after it had lost its original meaning should revert in their work to that earliest sense which is preserved in our word "grease."

But although Mr. Freeman maintains that a comparison is not unassailable until it has been approved by the strictest philological tribunal as coming within the sphere of its jurisdiction, he seems to be somewhat impatient of these trammels, and to plead for the acceptance of inferences which flow or seem to flow from such comparisons. The positive argument in the science of comparative politics he regards as conclusive; but the negative argument, he thinks, is by no means so strong:—

The caprice of language is so great, words drop out of use in one tongue and are kept in use in another in such a singular way, that the mere fact that cognate institutions are not called by cognate names is not, of itself, proof that they are not part of a common heritage. We must weigh all the circumstances and all the different forms of evidence. Of all the forms of corroborative evidence, the philological form is doubtless the highest, but it is not the only one. If two nations are shown by other evidence, especially by philological evidence applied to other subjects, to be kindred nations, holding in common a large share of the primitive common stock—if the nature of their political institutions, no less than of their language, their mythology, their customs of other kinds, naturally suggests the thought of a common derivation—the mere fact that their institutions do not bear cognate names is not enough to disprove, or even to throw doubt upon, the common derivation of those institutions.

This position is, we believe, thoroughly sound; but it is certainly not strengthened by placing narrower bounds on inference in the kindred science of comparative mythology. It may be convenient for Professor Max Müller to confine himself to an examination of those myths in which, although they belong to different languages and tribes, the names are philologically identical. He has nowhere, so far as we are aware, put the fact of his thus limiting himself on any other ground than that of convenience; but no reason is thus furnished why another should not extend his view to myths in which, while they unquestionably resemble each other in substance, the names translate each other, or in which identical incidents occur in a complex sequence which makes the notion of independent origination impossible. There is no etymological connexion between the Teutonic story of the Spirit in the Bottle, and the Arabian Nights' tale of the Fisherman and the Jin; nor between the Greek Oedipous, who knows nothing, and the Boots or the Great Fool of Teutonic and Celtic tradition; but their connexion is as manifest as that between the Senate of the Romans and the Gerousia of Sparta.

The philological argument will probably be found to go further both in politics and mythology than is commonly supposed. The English *cyning* and the Gothic *thiudans* translate each other, as being each called after the *kin* or people, and they both denote the same office. The Greek *Basileus* and the Latin *rex* translate each other, but the names have not the same origin; yet the *regnum* of the Latin King is the *rice* of the English; if of the one we say *rex*, of the other we say that he *rixode*, as the Greek *Basileus* was said *ἀρχεν*—all these words being referred by Bopp to the root *brāj*, to *shine*, which gives us the Eastern *raja* on the one side, and the Teutonic *Bragi* or Light God on the other.

With the rest of this volume we have only to express our hearty agreement; nor do we quarrel with anything in it because we are familiar with it already in Mr. Freeman's pages elsewhere. The facts stated seldom come in the same connexion, and, whatever may be said to the contrary, it is absolutely necessary to state many facts or discoveries again and again, until they work their way down into the minds of all alike. The connexion between the languages of Greeks, Latins, and Germans is still hidden from vast numbers of people, and the putting forth of comparisons between their habits, laws, and their political institutions is like the uttering of dark sentences. But probably some of the points on which Mr. Freeman insists might have been made plainer if he had carried his examination somewhat further back. Thus we are told that the gathering of *curia* or *phratrīai* forms the tribe, the gathering of tribes

* *Comparative Politics*. Six Lectures read before the Royal Institution in January and February, 1873. With the Unity of History, the Rede Lecture read before the University of Cambridge, May 29, 1872. By Edward A. Freeman, M.A., Hon. D.C.L., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co.

forms the State. But alike at Rome and at Athens tribes formed of *curie* and *gentes* lost their political significance, and gave way as political institutions to tribes of later origin founded on another principle. In the later stages of both Commonwealths, the elements of which the Commonwealth was made up were no longer the primitive genealogical tribes, but tribes which were essentially local.

This is, of course, perfectly true, but there is a distinct effort of mind in retaining our knowledge of the change until we know why the change was rendered necessary; because, namely, the genealogical tribes represented ultimately an aggregation of families, each of which at starting had formed the beginning and end of society, founded on the worship of the dead lord or lords, keeping up a ritual in which it was a profanation for any one not of kin to share, regarding all without its own circle as dogs or snakes, bitterly intolerant and intensely cruel in its exclusiveness; because, further, this root of all bitterness was carried on into those unions of such isolated families which made up the clan before the union of clans formed the tribe—the clans and tribes acquiring of course a fellow-feeling and a certain spirit of forbearance towards each other, but retaining for all who lay beyond a hatred not less fierce and bloodthirsty as being a hatred of those who were enemies of their gods; because, further, the chiefs of these families had set up their landmarks and shut out the common herd from all hope of becoming themselves owners of the soil, and because the remedies applied by such legislators as Solon, although for the time they did much, failed to touch the root of the disease. Hence the substitution of local for genealogical tribes was really a deathblow dealt to Eupatrid ascendancy; it ensured first the growth and then the supremacy of the people; it asserted that religion—the old religion, to which alone the Eupatrid would allow the name—was not to crush mankind for ever beneath a rod of iron. But although it did all this, the genealogical tribes were not extinguished. At Athens, as elsewhere, they continued to exist, as bodies whose interests were by no means always the interests of the State, of justice, or of humanity; and their malignant influence showed itself in the frightful iniquities to which the Athenian rabble suffered itself to be hounded on after the victory of Argennoussai.

In short, everywhere we find this spirit of isolation—the primitive separation of the brute in his den, strengthened by the religion which had its root in the worship of ancestors—cropping up in greater or less strength. We find it at Athens, checking and hampering the action of statesmen as far-seeing as any of what we are wont to speak of as our own enlightened times, and almost everywhere else in Hellas, well nigh preventing all political growth, and rendering utterly impossible the formation of a Greek nation.

We touch a point here in which difference of terms implies a difference of things. Mr. Freeman admits that we "expect, as a rule, the nation to form a single government," and that "political unity enters into our general idea of a nation"; but this fact, he holds, "merely shows how greatly we have changed in this matter from the political ideas of earlier times." In the Greek mind, for example, he urges, "there was a distinct idea of a Greek nation, united by a common origin, speech, religion, and civilization." Surely so wide a difference in reality involves a substantial difference in the notion of which that reality is an expression. Whatever else a nation may be, it is surely a body the members of which are under certain duties to one another. Of these obligations the Greek knew nothing. The war of Boiotians against Phokians was not civil war; it was not a thing to which they felt the least repugnance; it was the most natural thing in the world. When Achilles said that he had no liking for a man who loved war, he added that by war he meant a contest between members of a phratry, i.e. between those who professed to trace their origin and to pay their worship to a common ancestor. The Amphiktyonian, great or small, were in no sense nations national; at best they were mere religious fraternities which bound their members to no special courses of action if they chose to regard one another as enemies. In other words, they did little or nothing to weaken and root out the spirit of isolation which for all Greeks, except the Athenians, may be said to have remained the very breath of life. During three, or perhaps four, generations Athens did what she could to counteract this fatal tendency, but she was attempting a task beyond the time, and she failed. Mr. Freeman might perhaps have brought out more clearly the nature and ends of the work which some Athenian statesmen at least had set before themselves; but the contrasts drawn between Athens and Sparta, and again between these and Macedonia and Rome, are among the most instructive portions of this volume.

SOME TIME IN IRELAND.*

IRELAND was long celebrated for its blunders and bulls, but of late years it has proved prolific in bores. It is to be hoped that, in accordance with the old saying about the happiness of a country which has no history, the prosiness of modern books about Ireland denotes the calm of increasing prosperity. Why the book which we have now before us was written can be known only to its author. This venerable lady, who lived in the county Waterford a long time ago, and who now publishes the chronicle of her frocks, her flirtations, and her fine acquaintances, has no perceptible aim of any kind. There are faint indications of a wish to instruct

the "legislators who assemble in St. Stephen's, Westminster," and perhaps the author expected to rouse the attention of gossips by her free mention of persons and places, as for instance, of a well-known proselytizing Bishop, and of an excitable lady of the Bonaparte family. But few things are more dreary than sketches of character by a writer who neither appreciates character nor knows how to draw.

Although there is little worth reading in the book, it is racy of the author's native soil. It is pervaded with the volatile essence of Irish gentility, and, though the analysis may not be agreeable, this extraordinary phase of human nature is singular enough to be worth examining. "We never affected to be considered native Irish," she says, and she is careful to explain that her ancestors "came over with other Cromwell settlers." And then we have a fairly true, if trivial, sketch of servility and arrogance, of bigotry and religious indifference, of rackrenting and ostentation, and of shift instead of thrift in the annals of this "leading family." The writer appears even to have lost the last inheritance of such parentage as she describes, for she misses the grotesque humour, the incongruity yet the pathos, of the situation. The race of orators and wits who buzzed and stung in the Irish Parliament was not extinct at the period when these chronicles begin, but there is no trace of them here; the author is chiefly concerned with the misdemeanours of her governess, the tricks to catch the major or the captain on the Mall at Waterford, or the millinery of her sisters. Many pages are devoted to the unutterable glory of a ball at Curraghmore, and to the galaxy of young noblemen who were there. Now, in a novel certain details of the dietary and pinafors of childhood may be useful in evolving character, but we get no clearer notion of Irish society by records of Miss Kathleen's porridge and Miss Eveleen's "hat of white chip with detached bouquets of forget-me-nots." Probably there were elements of fun in the Dunmore *villeggiatura*, where the nobility and gentry of the county packed themselves into a row of cottages by the sea and chaffered for the shilling chicken of tradition and enjoyed a primitive community of crockery and saucepans. But if there were humorous passages in this kind of life, the spirit of the fun has evaporated, leaving but a residuum of vulgarity.

The author turns from domestic life every now and then and tries her hand on historical and political subjects with indifferent success. O'Connell crosses the stage at a contested election, "his right hand waving his cap, his left placed on his breast, across which was a broad green sash"; and of course he appeals to the "hereditary bondsmen." There are "priestly denunciation" evictions, and the machinery familiar to us in Irish affairs, not omitting the showy, dishonest, tyrannical land agent who has for nearly two hundred years played so large a part in them. This ancient lady shows questionable taste in gossiping as freely as she does about families and persons who, whatever their sins, hardly deserved the cruel fate of being thus commemorated. Yet after all, her visit to Curraghmore has a moral worth noting. Her Cromwellian father represents a class. He was a large landed proprietor and an important personage in the county, but he had none of the dignity of an English squire of the same rank. By tradition and practice he and his forefathers were mere dealers in land. The rights and privileges of their position were greedily maintained, but only as so much stock-in-trade, while political and religious ascendancy was deemed precious because it enhanced the value of the bargain with the English Government. It is perhaps natural that this species of gentry should be depressed and servile in presence of the English party in the great house of the neighbourhood. They cringe to the "Marquis, his amiable lady, and the sweet Lady Constance." London clothes, London airs and gossip are the paradise of the children of the Cromwellian settlement. There is a special roll in the phrases that treat of the English magnates, and in the reflections on their mortality at the end of those chapters that introduce us to the festive scenes in which Lord Jocelyn dances "superbly," and in which "an intimacy is established" with the transcendent Lady Constance. "Alas," mourns the author, "in the language of the patriarch," even these "have said to Corruption, thou art my father!"—a language which in another sense the politician might well apply to the Irish gentry, whose characteristics the book is intended to set forth. Coming down from the mount of aristocratic glory with its effulgence full upon them, the family remain in a rapture during some days. Only a contested election, in which the "Romish" priests of course play an evil part, brings them back to the joys and excitements of "the Mall," the Cathedral gallery, and the fashionable milliner's shop of Waterford.

The political battle between clergy and landlords for the votes of the people is far from being so amusing and instructive in these pages as in some recent reports from the West of Ireland. As usual, no one appears to be the least in earnest. There is no principle to control the conduct of rich or poor, though principles are trailed in every direction for aggressive purposes. The author, while ignoring the faith and hopes about which the Irish are really in earnest, unconsciously expresses the national superficiality. Of her reminiscences, now of a bonnet, now of a brutal murder, of her reflections, whether on the massacre of police at Carrickshock during the tithe war, or on the best way to catch a husband, it is impossible to know which are meant in jest and which are serious. If she ridicules the priests, she is not less satirical at the expense of the "Evangelical wave." She shows the usual Hibernian disrespect for everything Irish, including her uncle, a dignitary of the Protestant Church; and even when she utters the stock remarks

* *Some Time in Ireland: a Recollection.* London: Henry S. King & Co. 1874.

about the late Establishment, or the famine, or about the social sores with which we are too familiar, it is difficult to resist the suspicion that when she is most solemn and bombastic she least expects to be taken in earnest. The glimpse she gives of her class and its ideas, however slight, reveals at least some of the weaknesses which have made it contemptible and injurious to the people it was supposed to lead. We see something of the disreputable struggle by these land traders to be great men on swamped estates, of their incapacity for co-operation because of mutual distrust, and of their consequent loss of caste and power. Their clamour rends the air when truth is spoken of them, yet their indifference to truth is extraordinary, except when for some jobbing purpose it suits them to be sensitive.

This book, except in so far as it unconsciously betrays certain flaws in Irish character, has hardly the merit even to provoke a smile. The author, venerable matron as she announces herself, betrays her natural frivolity in every page. She buttonholes us to tell of her delightful acquaintance with the "tall and slim Lord P.," with Lord J., a "man of fashion, with a decidedly military carriage," and with "the Marquis." We have specimens of aristocratic chit-chat concerning "the Earl's Mother, who prays, preaches, and expounds in public," and we are bound to confess that our author shows a very pretty familiarity with exalted personages when she adds, "Every one knows what Lord Jocelyn's Father's views are about worldly amusements," capital letters being indispensable in expressing these august relationships. With the same gush she makes obeisance to "the last of the Prince Bishops of the Irish Church," and to the "brick-coloured satin Toques" of his sisters, who did the honours of that ball at Carraghmore which was the culminating point of our heroine's career. Her question to her uncle the canon, while driving thither in his carriage—doomed subsequently by the "trucking policy of the English Government" to be "laid down"—will serve as an example of the author's opinions. *Appropos* of a shabby equipage which follows, she asks:—

"Uncle, is there any connexion between politics and post-chaises?"

"Very good, Kathleen; your father will not have to be ashamed of his pupil. There is a connexion. If England had not absorbed the Irish upper classes, we should have had a resident aristocracy, with their becoming equipages, and a body of wealthy gentry taking a proper pride in keeping up carriages adapted to their position—very different to that which is hanging on us."

Satire could scarcely go further than this ingenuous exposition of the grievances and duties of "carriage people" in Ireland.

It is evident that when the author of these reminiscences leaves her native land her prejudice abates. Cheltenham and Leamington soothe the distempered spirit, and after a time she is ready to converse with Cardinal Wiseman and even to look on at Romish ceremonies. It is unfortunate that she should have recurred to exciting topics. She ought to have avoided the old stimulants of appropriation clauses, Catholic claims, and Lord Waterford. As it is, they seem to have quite upset the balance of her mind, or surely she would not in her preface have suggested Home Rule as a step towards bringing about that happy state when the Protestant canons of Ireland shall maintain their carriages in due splendour, when domesticated marquises shall give perennial balls to a numerous "army," and admiring Saxons crowd to do homage before Erin's daughters.

THE COINS OF ANCIENT SYRACUSE.*

ABOUT a year ago, in noticing Mr. Poole's Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum, we expressed the hope that the science of Greek numismatics might be developed not merely by general catalogues, but by critical essays and monographs on the coins of particular Greek cities. The memoir before us, in which Mr. Head gives in a very clear form the numismatic history of Syracuse during a period of more than three hundred years, is a welcome instalment as far as it goes. Numismatists and students of art need hardly be reminded that the coinage of Syracuse is more continuous and complete than that of any other Greek city. Those celebrated silver pieces known to the collector as Syracusan medallions, but which it would be more correct to describe as decadrachms struck by the two Dionysii, are among the finest efforts of ancient numismatic art, and are the more interesting to us because through a series of earlier coins we can trace the successive steps by which this marvellous perfection was attained. The method of Mr. Head's memoir is to show how by numismatic evidence the entire series of Syracusan coins can be classed in periods from the latter part of the fifth century to the capture of the city by Marcellus B.C. 212. In its main outlines this classification corresponds very nearly with that proposed by the late Duke of Luynes in the *Revue Numismatique* (1843). It was that distinguished archaeologist who first identified the archaic silver decadrachm of Syracuse with the Demareteion struck by Gelon I. in honour of his wife Demarete about B.C. 479, the year after his great victory over the Carthaginians at Himera. On comparing the legend of this coin with the dedicatory inscription on the helmet dedicated by Hiero I. at Olympia about B.C. 475, we find such a marked resemblance in the forms of the letters as fully to justify the identification proposed by the Duke

of Luynes. The date of this archaic decadrachm being thus found, there is little difficulty in determining the chronological succession of the silver coinage of Syracuse generally. Certain coins more archaic than the Demareteion in style, and differing from it in type, are on good grounds assigned by Mr. Head to the period of the Geomori, whose oligarchy preceded the rule of Gelon. Another cardinal point in the chronology is the coinage of the two Dionysii, B.C. 406-345. If we assume, as numismatists now generally assume, that those splendid medallions to which we have already referred are decadrachms struck by the Dionysii in imitation of the earlier Demareteia, we can range round these cardinal specimens of the Syracusan mint a number of smaller contemporary pieces; and, having thus demonstrated by emphatic examples the general characteristics of the Archaic and of the Finest Periods of Syracusan art, we have no difficulty in discriminating the coinage of the Intermediate or Transitional Period, which ranges from B.C. 466 to B.C. 406. From the time of the Dionysii the work of classification is much easier. The mintage of the democracy restored by Timoleon, B.C. 345-17, is recognized by the Corinthian types then introduced; the coins of Agathokles, B.C. 317-289, of Hiero II., his queen Philistis, and his grandson Hieronymos, B.C. 216-5, all known to us by their legends, enable us to class a number of pieces struck during these reigns, but not inscribed with the name of the ruling prince.

The admirable photographic plates executed by the autotype process, which illustrate Mr. Head's memoir, exhibit most clearly and emphatically the development of Syracusan art through these successive periods; and when we compare this long series of coins with the contemporary works of Greek sculptors, we see how the broad characteristics of style which distinguish the monumental works of successive centuries repeat themselves with a regularity to which there are few exceptions on the coins of the same periods throughout the Hellenic world. If we possessed the coinages of the principal Greek cities in a series as perfect as Syracuse exhibits, we should have, as it were, so many biographies in illustration of the general scheme of ancient art; but when we examine the extant specimens of other Hellenic mints, we find no such complete chain of numismatic evidence as at Syracuse, but rather a few disconnected links, the original sequence of which cannot be determined, because we do not know how much is wanting to complete the series. The coinage of Syracuse is a fair volume with hardly a page wanting; the coinages of other Greek cities are for the most part but stray and tattered leaves torn from such a volume. After perusing the numismatic history of Syracuse from beginning to end as it is recorded in Mr. Head's plates, the following points strike us as specially noteworthy.

We have, first, to note the marked preference for certain types which prevails in the silver coinage from the time of the Geomori till that of Timoleon. During this entire period the dominant type on the reverse of the coins is either a four-horse chariot or a horseman. Both these types from the time of Gelon I. onwards, if not from an earlier date, commemorate Agonistic Victories, and that these victories were gained at Olympia seems on the whole the most probable supposition. In a valuable memoir in the tenth volume of the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, Mr. Poole notes how this chariot type prevails in other cities of Sicily, such as Agrigentum, Kamarina, Katana, and shows how in the several instances its adoption may be connected with Agonistic Victories recorded in Pindar and elsewhere. Chariot-races and horse-races were then, as now, contests in which the rich only could win the prizes; and thus these Agonistic types on coins seem always associated with aristocratic or monarchical rule, and it may be doubted whether they were ever introduced under other political conditions. It was but natural that the rich and the ambitious should prefer these Agonistic types, for the coinage was thus made to publish the honour gained by the city, while it commemorated the wealthy aristocrat or political adventurer at whose cost this honour had been won; and doubtless this compendious publication, through a currency which passed in daily traffic from hand to hand, contributed not a little to that celebrity of the victor of which the "breathing Bronzes" dedicated at Olympia and the fervid Odes of Pindar were the nobler and more abiding record. On those earliest silver tetradrachms of Syracuse which are attributed to the Geomori, the *quadriga* is driven by a male charioteer, the horses move with hearse-like monotony; there is as yet no symbol of Agonistic Victory. On the coins of Gelon I. the winged personification of Victory, whom the Greeks called Nike, makes her first appearance, lying rather than flying above the chariot. From the reign of Hiero I. to that of Dionysius I. this type continues with little change; in the later specimens better modelling gives more life to the horses, and the Nike becomes more volatile; but the old slow movement is retained, as if the incident represented were not the chariot race, but the triumphal procession after the race.

With the accession of Dionysius there is a marked change in the design of the coin. It is no longer the triumphal procession, but the contest itself in all its intensity, which is represented. The horses dash forward eagerly, their tendency to loose and disunited action is by the skill of the charioteer so modulated as to blend into one common movement, which may be described as a harmony made up of discords; and this marvellous result is accounted for when we look at the charioteer. No mortal hand guides these fiery steeds; it is a goddess—perhaps Persephone—who has taken the place of the bearded charioteer whom we find on the earlier coins. We would here draw attention to the execution of these coins. The skill with which the forms of the four

* On the Chronological Sequence of the Coins of Syracuse. By Barclay V. Head, Assistant-Keeper of Coins and Medals in the British Museum, Hon. Sec. of the Numismatic Society of London. London: John Russell Smith. 1874.

horses, so intricately combined in their united action, are yet so clearly detached and relieved against the field and against each other, is a *tour de force* hardly to be surpassed in numismatic art.

While in the chariot groups of the earlier Syracusan coins the severe and chaste simplicity of the design seems the fit emblem of an earnest and high-minded democracy, there is on the other hand in these later compositions a felicitous audacity of invention, a consummate mastery of execution, which reminds us of some of the groups in the contemporary frieze of the Mausoleum, and seems altogether in keeping with the splendid pomp with which the Dionysii masked the terrors of their iron rule. The jealous misgiving with which these tyrants regarded distinguished citizens did not apply to the artists whom they patronized, and thus we find on the Syracusan medallions, what was hardly ever permitted on the coins of Greek autonomous cities, the names of the die-engravers, Kimon, Eukleides, Eaninetos, and others, whose respective styles may to a certain extent be distinguished in extant specimens. On the coins struck by the Dionysii there is a change in the action of the Victory, who no longer crowns the horses as in the earlier type, but flies to meet the charioteer holding out the wreath; her movement, being thus counter to that of the horses, seems to enhance the speed and momentum of the bounding group.

We have as yet only dealt with the reverse of these coins. On the obverse the prevailing type is a female head, round which are set sometimes three, sometimes four, dolphins. Occasionally the head, encircled by dolphins, is that of the goddess Athene. Dolphins are the well-known symbol of salt water in ancient art, and therefore it seems probable that the heads so encircled represent goddesses whose temples stood in the island of Ortygia, the most ancient quarter in Syracuse, and its original citadel. This position, naturally strong, was specially fortified by the elder Dionysius, who established in Ortygia his seat of government and his palace. He would probably keep his treasure and his mint in one of the temples on the island, of which the two most celebrated, according to Cicero, were that of Artemis and that of Athene. Now if the coins of the Dionysii were struck in Ortygia, the head of Athene, encircled by dolphins, probably represents in the compendious symbolism of ancient art the temple of Athene on the sea-girt island; and by parity of reasoning the other female head surrounded by dolphins ought to be that of Artemis, as K. O. Müller supposed it to be. There is, however, no certain evidence in support of this conjecture, and the head in question may in some cases be a personification of Ortygia itself, while other coins may represent Persephone, and others the Ortygian Artemis. Another type, which can be more positively connected with the island, represents the head of Arethusa, that nymph so celebrated in Greek legend, who, flying from the pursuit of the Arcadian river god Alpheios, escaped to Ortygia, where she was changed into a fountain, the fresh waters of which still bubble up on the shore of the island.

On looking over the plates in the work before us, it is curious to observe how, after B.C. 345, when the rule of the Dionysii was replaced by democracy, the type of the silver coinage also changes. That well-known Corinthian type, a helmeted female head, with, on the reverse, a Pegasus, occurs abundantly; the chariot type is also found, but less frequently; but of the dolphin-encircled goddess Mr. Head only admits one example. The cause of this change in the mintage was doubtless political. When Timoleon, the Garibaldi of ancient Sicily, leading an expedition from Corinth against the younger Dionysius, succeeded in his daring attempt by the special grace of Demeter and Persephone, he demolished the Ortygian stronghold of the dethroned tyrant, and erected on its site courts of justice. It was but natural that he should at the same time efface from the coinage the symbols by which the Ortygian fortress had been associated with supreme authority, and that he should substitute for these symbols the types of his native Corinth, whose aid as mother city had so largely contributed to the revolution which freed Syracuse. When compared with the splendid coinage of the Dionysii, the pieces struck by Agathokles and his successors are tame and monotonous. The names of the die-engravers no longer appear on the coins, nor does their work attempt to rival the subtleties which through all time will give celebrity to the masterpieces of Kimon, Eukleides, and their compeers. But in this later Syracusan coinage, as in many other coinages of the Macedonian period, the historical interest in some degree compensates for the artistic shortcoming. The assumption of the title of Basileus by Agathokles, his great victory over the Carthaginians, and the brief reign of the Epirote Pyrrhus in Sicily, are all commemorated on their coins; while later still on the coins of Hiero II. we recover the name of his queen Philistis, a name still to be seen on her seat in the theatre of Syracuse, but wholly unrecorded by ancient writers.

CRAMLEIGH COLLEGE.*

CRITICS who complain of the immense numbers of novels which are published every season forget how wide a field of usefulness novel-writing now occupies, and how many other resources of folly it is rapidly superseding. In ages which are called dark and barbarous, every man who was discontented resorted to caves and other fastnesses, and thence made incursions, and avenged himself on society. This is the case even now in Spain and other countries where literature is at rather a low ebb.

* *Cramleigh College*. By Henry Belcher. 3 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1874.

How much more fortunate is England, where the man with a grievance merely writes a novel with a purpose, and throws this harmless pebble at the public! Novel-writing has saved many a woman from the still lower depth of minor poetry, from religious depression, and from inflicting herself spasmodically on the local poor. It is the safest safety-valve, the mental anodyne nearest to hand, the easiest occupation for indolent conceit, the best cure for the aching heart; for the treacherous lover can always be drawn from real life, and persons who shrink from breach of promise cases may put the false one into a book. Thus novel-writing affords many of the consolations which our energetic forefathers sought in war and in religion, and society becomes more peaceful, though less picturesque. In place of bandits and crusaders we have crowds of writers of fiction. Life is much less stormy than it was before reading and writing became such common accomplishments, and the efforts of silly people are only annoying, not positively pernicious. Still they are very numerous, and very wearisome to those who have to read them. Which may be the very silliest of these silly ones, we sometimes wonder, just as Mr. Carlyle once speculated as to where the greatest of living fools might be existing all unconscious of his greatness. The question admits of no answer, and the wonder will never be satisfied. The *chef d'œuvre* is equivalent to the *chef d'œuvre*, and there are sublimities of silliness among which no man may decide which is the most barren and worthless. Who shall judge between the frantic author who drags his characters through crimes that are artistically blunders and the twaddling writer who dawdles over the conscientious scruples of consumptive cousins? But if opinions differ as to which may be the most imbecile fiction of the period, no reader of *Cramleigh College* will have much hesitation in pronouncing it to be the most tedious. Victor Hugo once said of another French poet that his works caused a new kind of shudder, and the author of *Cramleigh College* has managed to cause a new sort of yawn. This is his private glory and distinction, for unluckily there is nothing singular in his bad grammar or in the jargon which he takes to be English. Novelists have long accustomed us to such sentences as "He valued people, like certain persons are said to value books, by their binding"; "He was kept in front of the black-board until he felt somewhat like an Egyptian statue must feel, as having sat down never to get up again." Nor is Mr. Belcher original in calling soap and towels "minor accessories of aqueous hygienics." Many writers are practised in such beauties of style, and most are dull; but Mr. Belcher is wearisome of set purpose, and dull in obedience to an æsthetic theory of his own invention. He has obviously given some thought to the conditions of fiction, and favours us with his views as to what a romance should be:—

There still remains a vast amount of mere commonplace matter that the hand of a master could touch, clear of undramatic element, by rearrangement of parts, and make powerful, didactic, full of feeling, for most of us. I should like to read a novel dealing with this stage of life. . . . The adventures of a half-pay captain, married to a lady with a small fortune in the Three per Cents, might be worked up into a most interesting narrative.

Mr. Belcher acts on his own theory, but he cannot be said to have worked up his petty material and dreary characters into a most interesting narrative. There is no element in *Cramleigh College* that is not commonplace and sordid; there is no single character who, if met in real life, would not be recognized as a typical bore. The lay figures of other novelists are dreary because they have no animation, because they are mere puppets. But the characters in *Cramleigh College* are drawn rather carefully, and so to speak lovingly, from the most tiresome people that an unlucky man might meet in the course of a long and unhappy existence. And the author has been careful to provide them with what Mr. Congreve would call an appropriate *milieu*, an atmosphere of tedium.

Cramleigh College is a novel with a purpose, or rather with two or three purposes. The writer has a grudge against competitive examinations and crammers. This grievance pervades his first volume, while the third is occupied with the dangers of financial speculation. There is absolutely no plot, for the typical bore who do duty for characters have no passions which might supply the stuff for a plot. The reader is left to contemplate these persons, and to derive what pleasure he may from the comparative study of different forms of meanness and vulgarity. Perhaps in the complete absence of any other interest, it may be as well to give some account of the different bores whom the author has depicted with such tender anxiety. Bore number one, his favourite specimen, is the hero's mother, who is thus described:—

She, in her eagerness to find out all that could readily be known of a new topic, would fill her drawing-room with outlandish people twice or thrice a week. Experiments were conducted that filled the house with noises, burnings, and uncelestial smells; sometimes she fossilized, and then it was bones, sometimes she spiritized, and then it was ghosts; sometimes she parochized, and then it was soup.

Elsewhere her praises as a specimen of dreariness are stated with proper pride:—"Her mind was of the cast that bores some folks terribly. It would be hard to conceive a greater bore than Hester Chatfield might be to not a few persons to be met with in life." Her surroundings are described as being quite worthy of her. Mr. Belcher has introduced some of her insufferable connexions, confessedly because they are depressing, and he dismisses them thus:—"This couple drop away from our view. It is true they have played no particular part in this story, but what more was to be done with them?" What indeed? and what amusement can be got out of any of the other dullards who do play some part in this story, such as it is? The parochizing woman's part is to pet her son, and make

love to his schoolmaster. The son Arthur, who is the hero of the tale, is simply a Cub, who is sent to Cramleigh College—a private school kept by one Dr. Chatfield Jonah, a bore of the old school. The doctor's forte is preaching sermons—we are actually favoured with one—and making misquotations from Horace. These accomplishments endear him to the widow, and while she is longing for the teacher, the Cub is plucked in an examination for the army. Soon afterwards he has something as like brain fever as his constitution admits of, and his personal appearance is improved by his illness. At least we suppose that is what we are meant to gather from the following remarkable sentence:—

His figure was slight as yet, but on the whole looked a fair reproduction of some old Norse stock. He would have made a capital Balar, given the large limbs of that Hyperborean Apollo, but had a certain languid ease, out of place in one so much like a Bare Sarker, yet was not unbecoming in a young gentleman of the nineteenth century.

This reads like an unfair reproduction of some of Mr. Kingsley's old Norse stuff, but the reference to our friend the Bare Sarker is welcome as a momentary escape from the usual level of the story. The Cub is sent to Ireland for the benefit of his health, and it might be expected that the author would grow less tedious under the influence of Irish air. An ordinary novelist would be tempted to borrow animal spirits from an imitation of Lever or Lover, but Mr. Belcher never loses sight of his purpose. He is careful to impress us with the belief that Irish humour is a myth, and that dirt and drink are the only characteristics of the island. The town of Knockdownmore is thus described:—"Its chief feature is a bridge. Without this bridge nothing would be left for the Knockdownmoreites but to hang themselves from sheer inanition." By inanition it is improbable that Mr. Belcher means starvation, though to hang oneself from starvation would be a very Irish way of solving the riddle of the earth. Knockdownmore, slovenly as it was, was the residence of Miss Evelyn Blake, the heroine of this story. Miss Blake was well worthy of the Cub's affection. "She was the kind of girl that has a quiet way of making love to any presentable man without the slightest glimmer of consciousness that very few men can stand being made love to by the Eva Blakes of the world." This unconscious creature has a way of kissing the Cub, and of employing "an elevation of her pretty eyebrows, and a contraction of the eyelid, the left eyelid," which must have done a good deal to relieve the tedium of Knockdownmore. Her uncle, Colonel Blake, runs the other bores of the story very hard; indeed we incline to think that he is the most musty and repulsive specimen in the collection. He is a learned campaigner who translates his talk into Greek, and quotes no less assiduously than the Doctor. By a rare stroke of genius the writer has contrived to keep either the Colonel or the Doctor eternally on the stage, and sometimes they are both present together, so that we can never escape from shreds of the Latin grammar. The other inhabitants of Knockdownmore are squireens and louts. Evelyn makes love to one of them, though he is not very presentable, and there are some dull adventures at a ball, where drunken men exchange blows and apologies. The Squireen takes Miss Blake and her cousin for a cruise by themselves in a yacht, proposes, is rejected, drinks himself stupider than he was before, and allows the yacht to be nearly run ashore. The characters are rescued by a man-of-war's boat commanded by Archie Lambert, a school companion of the hero, and Eva makes a good deal of love to him. She had already displayed her piety by "singing a little hymn" in the cabin of the yacht during the storm. Meantime the Doctor marries the hero's mother, and he and Eva are separated for two years.

As the Cub has grown too old to be crammed, the author now feels inclined to chastise the folly of rash speculation. So a wholly impossible stockjobber and member of Parliament is brought on the scene. We are asked to believe that this man was a cunning hypocrite who thought he could gain public confidence by winning the friendship of the foolish head of Cramleigh College. Of this hypocrite the author tells us that his vice was too subtle "to be handled successfully within the compass of three acts. The lines of it are not sufficiently deep, the features not sufficiently broad." There is nothing peculiarly "fine" in paying for a testimonial to a popular preacher with the view of borrowing some of the splendour of his sanctity, and all his wife's money. This is the delicate stratagem of Mr. Ffarindon, M.P., who invests the money in some bubble company. The bubble bursts, and the Doctor is considerably improved as a character by a paralytic stroke. He quotes Horace no more, but sinks into ordinary idiocy. The Cub marries Eva, who had failed to induce "any presentable man" to come forward in earnest.

This is the sum of the story; and it is difficult to see what excuse can be made for a tale which drags us through such dreary scenes and into such tedious company. There are cubs, silly widows, vulgar flirts, drunken squireens, and foolish pedants in real life, and their adventures probably have some feeble interest for themselves and their relations. But it is not easy to see what class of readers can be amused by a servile copy of their proceedings. Mr. Arnold says, in reference to Heine's bitter pictures of society, that it was to make us forget such barren nothings that "God gave the poet his song." Mr. Belcher is no poet, and the only gift he has shown is that of sufficient perseverance to fill three volumes with twaddle. Still he is responsible for the use he makes of this talent. It would be far better to hide it away for ever than to go on producing stories so ineffably tedious and depressing as *Cramleigh College*.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

FEW, it is probable, among the readers of Goethe's biography and correspondence have hitherto believed in the purely Platonic character of his attachment for Frau von Stein.* One of the highest living authorities on all subjects connected with Goethean literature now comes forward to maintain the proposition; and if he cannot be said to have produced much testimony in its favour, he is at all events successful in showing that there is just as little to be urged against it. The question seems one eminently adapted for being let alone. Goethe's letters to the object of his attachment are as interesting under one hypothesis as the other, and are reconcilable with either. The tone of Weimar society is not materially affected by one *liaison* more or less; and, take what view we may, Frau von Stein's husband appears equally a nonentity. So little, in fact, does he appear at all, that sterner moralists than the Weimar circle might feel tempted to apply the maxim *De non apparentibus et de non existentibus*. If people will form an opinion on the matter notwithstanding, they must at least bear in mind that half the documentary evidence is missing. Frau von Stein preserved Goethe's letters with religious care, but reclaimed and destroyed her own. No hint, at least, is given of their existence. The loss is much to be regretted, not for their possible bearing on the scandal of her day, but inasmuch as they would have materially contributed to determine the actual extent and nature of her influence on Goethe. Herr Düntzer rates this very highly, and is equally confident of its ennobling and purifying effect. He sees in her Goethe's Egeria, the guardian angel who guided and chastened the impulses of his versatile temperament, and educated him into that lofty conception of feminine dignity and purity typified in his *Iphigenia* and *Tasso*, dramas undoubtedly planned during the period of his attachment for her. A few specimens of her letters to him would contribute more than pages of speculation towards a decision of this question. Although, however, Herr Düntzer has not been able to recover these lost treasures, the assistance of Frau von Stein's family has enabled him to present us with several specimens of her communications to less interesting correspondents. These have been of much service to his book, which in the dearth of such material would have been little else than a commentary on Goethe's letters to her, and even now is hardly readable or intelligible without constant reference to them. Some of the new letters are very interesting, especially those from the Duchess of Weimar, whose regard for Frau von Stein seems to have been strong and genuine. The heroine's own letters, with every allowance for their usual reference to disagreeable business, still appear comparatively commonplace, and suggest that the secret of her influence over Goethe consisted less in moral or intellectual distinction than in her personal fascination, assisted by her slight seniority to himself, and her habituation to what was to him the novel sphere of Court life. According to Herr Düntzer, the ultimate rupture of their intimacy was occasioned by the Platonic yoke imposed by the lady having become intolerable to her adorer; this solution is as defensible as the more ordinary one, and not more so. There can be little doubt that, from whatever cause, Goethe had become weary of Frau von Stein before his departure for Italy; absence, new influences, and his own surprising mental development completed the estrangement, and Frau von Stein's inability to accommodate herself to the new condition of things precipitated the breach. Goethe did not acquit himself to advantage here; he must have felt very hard driven indeed when he could find no better answer to what must be presumed to have been a passionate appeal than to reproach the writer with her addiction, in spite of his remonstrances, to that pernicious beverage, coffee. It is impossible not to sympathize with Frau von Stein's laconic commentary—"O!" The second volume will comprise her biography after the death of her husband (1793), and will, it is announced, contain a much greater amount of unpublished correspondence than the present.

The second series of *Sketches of St. Petersburg Society†* would be more likely to attain their object if this were less obtrusively conspicuous. They are professedly the production of a Russian; such may be the case, but, if so, it is a Russian who thinks and feels as a German, and who derides the idea of his own country ever developing an indigenous civilization. It is improbable that any genuine Russian would display such deficiency in patriotic feeling, and still less likely that he would be inspired by this writer's determined animosity against France. The work is indeed in great measure a denunciation of French influence as a source of social corruption, in support of which the old story of Pushkin's death in a duel with a French officer is recounted at considerable length. The animus thus evinced deprives the writer's statements of much of the weight to which they might otherwise be fairly entitled when he descends to contemporary matters. It is impossible to resist the inference that German influence must be much on the decline in Russia to account for such bitterness of feeling. Too much importance, however, must not be accorded to this circumstance, as, whatever the tone of feeling in Russian society, the political course of the country will unquestionably be determined by her interests, and her alliance will always be attainable by the highest bidder. The last chapter of the work is devoted to the St. Petersburg Academy, of which a very unfavourable account

* *Charlotte von Stein, Goethe's Freundin*. Ein Lebensbild, mit Benutzung der Familienpapiere entworfen von H. Düntzer. Bd. 1. Stuttgart: Cotta. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Neue Bilder aus der Petersburger Gesellschaft*. Von einem Russen. Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot. London: Asher & Co.

is given, visibly tinged, however, with the same prejudice as all the rest. There may be, and probably is, much truth in all the writer's assertions, political and otherwise, but it will not be safe to accept any of them until confirmed from some less suspicious source.

The administration of Alsace* by its conquerors, both before and since the final cession of the province, served to raise many delicate problems both in international law and in general ethics. Professor Löning, of the University of Strasburg, has prepared a very temperate and well-digested account of these various questions as they arose, and of the processes of reasoning which on each occasion conducted the German authorities to a decision in their own favour. The book is an interesting example of the twofold tendency so frequently remarked as characteristic of our times—on the one hand, to reduce as far as possible the pressure of hostilities upon the private citizen; but, on the other, to curtail in like proportion his opportunities of taking a part in the defence of his country. This tendency is evidently very convenient to States where every able-bodied man is or may be made a regular soldier; as this is not the case in England, we can but trust that our jurists and diplomatists will be careful of countenancing any reasoning, however specious, which tends to restrict the formation and free action of irregular troops. The behaviour of the invaders shows that they dreaded the general resistance of the population more than anything else. Not the least inconvenience entailed by it was the exasperation produced by the measures of repression and retaliation to which they were compelled to have recourse, the memory of which may be said still to fight for France after the overthrow of her armies. We see no reason for concluding that these severities were in excess of what any other conquerors would have resorted to under similar circumstances; but their effect not the less emphasizes the hard fact that, when territory is at stake, it is the interest of the defeated party to embitter the struggle as much as possible. The annexation also raised a number of most interesting if less exciting questions, legal, financial, commercial, which are discussed by Dr. Löning with excellent temper and admirable perspicuity.

Adolf Ebert's History of Latin Christian Literature† is designed as the first volume of a complete history of the mediæval literature of Western Europe. It is consequently written rather from the literary than the theological point of view, and will appear an inadequate performance if judged with reference to the special needs of theological students, but is perhaps on that account all the better calculated to attract as well as instruct the general reader. It is also not professedly confined to works relating to religion, though practically almost restricted to this branch by the poverty of early Christian literature in every other. From the fiery outburst of the new element in Tertullian, the story is pursued until its almost total stagnation in the age of Charlemagne. The animation and energy which excite our admiration down to the fall of the Roman Empire had arisen from an influx of ideas new to classical literature, which by the conclusion of the last great ecclesiastical controversy had become totally exhausted. Its gradual renovation and transformation from a theological literature confined to a single dead language to a general literature vested in a living speech will form the subject of the second volume, in which especial attention will be given to the influence of Church hymns on the development of popular vernacular poetry. The present volume is prefaced by an able survey of the causes of the dissemination and ultimate triumph of Christianity under the Roman Empire.

Lieutenant Janke's book of travel‡ scarcely bears out the promise of the title-page. We are led to expect a work replete with professional information, and find instead the tour of a man of taste and letters, who details the ordinary incidents of an Italo-Levantine tour in a pleasant scholarly fashion, and only seems strangely unaware how little he has to tell that has not been already told. At the end of the book, however, we do meet with serviceable technical matter in the shape of an appendix on the organization of the Italian army. The writer speaks very favourably of the zeal and intelligence of the Italian officers, and of the excellence of the military arrangements in many respects. The chief drawback seems to be the condition of the fortresses, to place which in a proper condition would require an outlay far in excess of the resources of the nation.

That indefatigable traveller and voluminous author, Dr. Adolf Bastian§, proceeded to Lower Guinea last year as pioneer of the German exploring expedition which has selected that little known region as its basis of operations. After remaining a short time he was joined by Dr. Güssefeldt, the working head of the expedition, and returned after seeing due provision made for the successful execution of the enterprise. Everything has evidently been most carefully organized, and the undertaking wears rather the aspect of a permanent establishment in the country for scientific purposes than of a mere incursion of explorers. It only remains to be seen whether the audacity of the travellers will equal their

forethought, and whether they will venture sufficiently far from their carefully secured base to rival the fame of a Schweinfurth or a Livingstone. The shortness of Dr. Bastian's stay and the object of his mission were unfavourable to any extensive explanations on his own part. His personal narrative is nevertheless very interesting, and is composed with a clearness and simplicity strongly in contrast with the confused accumulation of valuable but ill-digested facts, chiefly derived from old travellers and geographers, which make up the larger part of his volume. Though claimed by the Portuguese, Lower Guinea north of the Congo appears to enjoy political independence, only slightly restrained by the influence of the numerous European factories. These mostly belong to the Dutch African Trading Company, which finds it however advantageous to employ Portuguese as its subordinate agents. The relation of the Europeans to the natives is in general amicable and mutually advantageous, the slave trade being now extinct, and no great negro power like Dahomey or Ashantee existing that might be capable of rendering itself troublesome. In fact, the excessive subdivision of the aborigines into small independent tribes is one of the difficulties of the traveller, each chief requiring to be propitiated by a separate negotiation. Another obstacle is the impression prevailing among them that all white men are literally brethren, in consequence of which any European is liable to be detained and held responsible for debts contracted by perfect strangers, which he is expected to discharge for the credit of the family. Human sacrifices like those of Ashantee and Dahomey seem to be unknown, but a still more devastating scourge is the reference of most physical disorders to witchcraft, and the continued slaughter of persons indicated by the priesthood as the culprits. The religion of the country is the grossest fetishism; the Catholic missions seem to have disappeared without leaving a trace. Dr. Bastian met with the utmost kindness and civility both from the Dutch and the Portuguese trading agents, and there seems every reason to regard the choice of Lower Guinea as a point of departure as highly judicious. We must suppose that one of the first endeavours of the expedition will be to open up the Congo, the least known of the great rivers of Africa.

The third part of Von Heuglin's narrative of the German expedition to Spitzbergen* is devoted to natural history. The fauna of that inhospitable region is richer in mammalia and birds than might have been expected; and the same remark would probably have held good of the lower orders of animal life had time and opportunity for investigation been available. The defectiveness of the chapters on botany and geology no doubt admits of the same excuse. Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the account of the vast accumulation of drift-wood found far inland, testifying at once to the direction of oceanic currents and to the upheaval of the land during the present geological epoch. These heaps have no connexion with the vastly more ancient deposits, formed *in situ*, of fossilized timber in Greenland.

The administration of our sanitary laws† is so continually affording matter for complaint and cavil that it is with a pleased surprise that we find it actually an object of admiration to an intelligent foreigner. It may well be that we ourselves are unduly exacting, and, in our impatience at the numerous shortcomings of our system, fail to consider the large amount of good which it accomplishes. Dr. Finkelnburg's favourable opinion of English sanitary legislation is in some degree due to the important part reserved by it for members of his own profession. He is also a strong advocate for local self-government, and perceives clearly that a task involving such endless minutiae as the care of the public health is one in which the public itself must take an active interest, and which cannot be performed by the most zealous of centralized administrations. At the same time he fully allows that some control from an external authority is essential to overcome the occasional obstructiveness of local bodies, and he highly approves of the recent English legislation with this object. His work is in the main a history of our sanitary laws since attention was first directed to the subject by the cholera of 1832, with an appendix giving a comparative view of the legislation of other civilized countries, and an exhortation to his countrymen to uphold the Teutonic principle of reliance on local management, rather than the dependence of Latin races on the machinery of an organized bureaucracy.

Dr. H. Düntzer must, as things‡ go, be reckoned among the more conservative critics of Homer, as he postulates no more than four Homers, respectively authors of the *Mijuv* and the *Tiuv*, whose juxtaposition has made the *Iliad*, and of an *Odyssey* and a *Telemachiad* as constituents of the second great epic. All these compositions, he considers, originated in Chios, from about a century previous to the first Olympiad until a period somewhat later than that of the institution of the festival. The writer may therefore be said to occupy a point of view equidistant from the speculations of Mr. Gladstone and of Mr. Paley.

Dr. P. Doetsch's essay on Juvenal in the character of a censor of his age§ is little more than a compilation of passages from the works of the satirist, in preparing which he has hardly been suffi-

* *Die Verwaltung des General-Gouvernements im Fluss. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts.* Von Dr. Edgar Löning. Strasburg: K. J. Trübner. London: Trübner & Co.

† *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis zum Zeitalter Karls des Grossen.* Von Adolf Ebert. Leipzig: Vogel. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Reise-Erinnerungen aus Italien, Griechenland und dem Orient. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der militärischen Verhältnisse.* Von A. Janke. Berlin: Schneider. London: Asher & Co.

§ *Die deutsche Expedition an der Loango-Küste.* Von Adolf Bastian. Bd. 1. Jena: Costenoble. London: Asher & Co.

* *Reisen nach dem Nordpolarmeer in den Jahren 1870 und 1871.* Von M. T. von Heuglin. Th. 3. Braunschweig: Westermann. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Die öffentliche Gesundheitspflege Englands nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und gegenwärtigen Organisation.* Von Dr. Finkelnburg. Bonn: Marcus. London: Williams & Norgate.

‡ *Die homerischen Fragen.* Von Dr. H. Düntzer. Leipzig: Hahn. London: Nutt.

§ *Juvenal ein Sittenrichter seiner Zeit.* Von P. Doetsch. Leipzig: Engelmann. London: Asher & Co.

ciently attentive to his own judicious maxim, that a satirist is inevitably an exaggerator. It is probable, however, that Juvenal's exaggeration does not so much consist in inaccuracy with respect to individual traits of corruption as in the omission of everything tending to indicate a healthy state of moral feeling. The letters of his contemporary Pliny would give a totally different impression of the age, and to obtain a faithful delineation of it it is necessary to combine the testimony of the declamatory moralist and the lettered magistrate with that of the representative "man about town," Martial.

Dr. Alexander Schmidt* may safely congratulate himself on having attained the modest ambition he professes of having in his *Shakespeare-Lexicon* produced a work useful to every Englishman. It is much more than this—a monument of taste and diligence, and, so far as we can at present judge, of copiousness and accuracy. It cannot fail greatly to promote the study of the author and the critical recension of his text, while adding yet another to the numerous instances of Germany doing for us what we ought to have long since done for ourselves.

Dr. W. Wagner's agreeable little essay on Shakespeare† is principally called forth by the recent attack of the late Roderick Benedix. It may be doubted whether it was worth while to wipe away the aspersions of a critic so unfortunately constituted as to be incapable of seeing anything admirable in the *Tempest*, especially as Dr. Wagner takes little notice of Benedix's strictures on the only side on which they are entitled to attention, the fitness of Shakespeare's plays for the modern stage. His own remarks, however, if not profoundly original, are almost always just. In speaking of *Troilus and Cressida* as probably a hasty work for stage purposes, he seems to forget that it alone among Shakespeare's pieces was never acted before publication. We could wish he had found more to say about Shakespeare's comedies.

* *Shakespeare-Lexicon*. A Complete Dictionary of all the English Words, Phrases, and Constructions in the Works of the Poet. By Dr. Alexander Schmidt. Vol. I. Berlin: Reimer. London: Williams & Norgate.

† *Shakespeare und die neueste Kritik*. Von Dr. W. Wagner. Hamburg: Nolte. London: Williams & Norgate.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 6d., or \$7 50 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 17 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 68 Boulevard de Strasbourg.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 981, AUGUST 15, 1874:

Parliamentary Reputations. The Bombay Riots.
Mr. Gouschen at Rome. Franco. Railway Dividends. Señor Castelar.
Drought in England. Educational Compromises.

Weak Points in Competitive Examination.

Devises. Medieval Projectors. Literary Policemen.
Dean Stanley on General Councils. Temple Bar. The Surrey Assizes.
Base-Ball. Loan Exhibition for Alsace and Lorraine.

Stibbe's Constitutional History.

A Genevese Poet. The Count of Paris's History of the American War.
Johnson on Landscape Gardening. Freeman's Comparative Politics.
Some Time in Ireland. The Coins of Ancient Syracuse.
Cramleigh College. German Literature.

CONTENTS OF No. 980, AUGUST 8, 1874:

The Prorogation—Germany and Spain—The Indian Budget—The French Assembly—The Annexation of Fiji—The End of the Womph Bill—The Suffolk Farmers and the Unionists—France and Rome.

Losses—New Statutes—Holiday-making at Home and Abroad—Sir William Harcourt on the Canon Law—The Carcase and the Vultures—Ultramontane and Old Catholics in Germany—The Corset—Doctors Differ—Racing in Sussex.

The Rights and Duties of Neutrals—Pearson's Dramatists—Spencer's Descriptive Sociology—The Disciples—Drayton's Motion of the Fixed Stars—Wordsworth, Shelley, and Keats—Onomatopoeia—Slavonic Folk-Lore—Forbes's Africa—Under Seal of Confession.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," with "The Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Night of the Crucifixion," "Christian Martyrs," "Francisca da Rimini," "Andromeda," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 38 New Bond Street, Ten to Six—Admission, 1s.

LAST WEEK BUT TWO.

"THE SHADOW OF DEATH."—Painted by Mr. HOLMAN. HUNT in Bethlehem, Jerusalem, and Nazareth (begun in 1869, completed end of 1873). NOW ON VIEW at 25 Old Bond Street. The Gallery is opened at Ten, closed at Six. Admission, 1s.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE. SCHOLARSHIPS IN SCIENCE.

Two Scholarships in Science have been founded at St. Bartholomew's Hospital:—
1. An Open Scholarship of the value of £100, tenable for one year, to be competed for in September. The Subjects of Examination are Physics, Chemistry, Botany, and Zoology. The Successful Candidate will be required to enter at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in October next.
2. Preliminary Scientific Scholarship of the value of £50, tenable for one year, to be competed for in October next, by Students of the Hospital of less than six months' standing. The Subjects of Examination are identical with those of the Open Scholarship.
For further particulars and syllabus of subjects, application may be made, personally or by letter, to THE WARDEN of the College, St. Bartholomew's Hospital.

THE OWENS COLLEGE, Manchester. Principal, J. G. GREENWOOD, LL.D.

PROFESSORS AND LECTURERS.
Greek J. G. Greenwood, LL.D., Fell. Univ. Coll. Lond.
Latin A. S. Wilkins, M.A., Fell. Univ. Coll. Lond.
English and History A. W. Ward, M.A., Fell. St. Peter's Coll. Cam.
Mathematics T. Barker, M.A., late Fell. Trin. Coll. Cam.
Natural Philosophy (Balliol Stewart, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.)
French (T. H. Core, M.A.)
Engineering O. Reynolds, M.A., Fell. Queens' Coll. Cam.
Logic and Philosophy W. S. Jevons, M.A., F.R.S., Fell. Univ. Coll. Lond.
Political Economy J. Bryce, D.C.L., Fell. Oriel Coll. Oxon.
Jurisprudence and Law H. E. Roscoe, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.
Theoretical and Practical Chemistry C. Schlenker, F.R.S.
Organic Chemistry W. C. Williamson, F.R.S.
Animal Physiology and Botany A. Gamgee, M.D., F.R.S.
Practical Physiology and Histology W. B. Dawkins, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S.
Geology C. A. Burghard, Ph.D.
Mineralogy T. Theodores.
Oriental Languages and German H. Eysmann, Ph.D.
Free Hand Drawing W. Walker.
Harmony J. F. Bridge, Mus. Doc. Oxon.
With Assistant Lecturers in all the principal Departments.

The next SESSION will commence on October 6.
Candidates for Admission must not be under Fourteen years of age, and those under Sixteen will be required to pass a preliminary examination in English, Arithmetic, and the elements of Latin.

Prospectuses of the several departments of the Day Classes, the Evening Classes, and the Medical School, and of the Scholarships and Entrance Exhibitions tenable at the College, will be sent on application.
J. HOLME NICHOLSON, Registrar.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, Galway.—The SESSION 1874-5 will commence on Tuesday, October 20, when the Supplemental, Scholarship, and other Examinations will be proceeded with, as laid down in the Prospectus.
The Examination for Matriculation in the several Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine, and in the Department of Engineering, will be held on Friday, October 23.
Further information, and copies of the Prospectus, may be had on application to the REGISTRAR.

By order of the President.

Queen's College, Galway.
August 10, 1874.
T. W. MOFFETT, LL.D., Registrar.

CRYSTAL PALACE SCHOOL OF PRACTICAL ENGINEERING. Principal—Mr. J. W. WILSON, Assoc. Inst. C.E.—The NEW TERM will commence on Monday, September 7. Candidates for admission will be passed on September 3, 4, and 5, and will be taken in the order of preliminary application. The number to be accepted is limited. Students can inscribe their names only in the Office of the School of Art, Science, and Literature, in the Library near the Byzantine Court, where Prospectuses can be obtained.

By Order of the Committee.

F. K. J. SHENTON, Sup. Literary Dept.

LEAMINGTON COLLEGE BOARDING HOUSE.—The NEXT TERM commences on September 22. Inclusive Terms from 70 to 50 Guineas. For Sons of Professional Men 10 Guineas less. There is a special Tutor and separate Dormitory, &c., for students. For particulars apply to the Rev. J. Wood, Head-Master, or to the Rev. J. S. RUDDACH, Chaplain and House-Master.

FULLANDS, TAUNTON.—OXFORD MATRICULATION and RESPONSES, and CAMBRIDGE PREVIOUS EXAMINATIONS.—PRIVATE TUITION, by Graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, for the Universities, the Indian Civil Service, Woolwich, and other Examinations generally. The next Term will begin on September 21.—For Prospectuses apply to the Rev. the SECRETARY.

FULLANDS SCHOOL, TAUNTON.—The aim of Fullands School is to provide for the SONS OF GENTLEMEN a thoroughly good Education, similar to that given at the Public Schools, but at a moderate cost.

Principal.

Mr. REED, Fellow of the College of Preceptors, London.

Vice-Principal.

HEAD MATHEMATICAL MASTER.—Rev. WILLIAM REED, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge; 16th Senior Optime, Tripos, 1869.
HEAD CLASSICAL MASTER.—FRANCIS REED, Esq., B.A., Exeter College, Oxford.
There are Three School Terms in the year, of an average duration of Thirteen weeks each. The Michaelmas Term begins on September 21, 1874.
Prospectuses may be obtained on application.

JERSEY.—ST. AUBIN'S SCHOOL. Head-Master—Mr. J. E. VIBERT, M.A., M.C.P. General climate. Healthy situation. Special attention to Modern Languages. Prospectuses on application.

PRIVATE TUITION for ARMY, COOPER'S HILL, CIVIL SERVICE, WOOLWICH, and UNIVERSITIES.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES (Wrang. Cam.) has passed over 300, and occasionally has VACANCIES. Also quite distinct young Boys.—Ealing, W.

ARMY, CONTROL, CEYLON WRITERSHIPS, INDIAN FORESTS, and ALL DEPARTMENTS of CIVIL SERVICE.—Mr. W. M. LUFTON, Author of several Manuals for Competitive Examinations, has for many years successfully PREPARED CANDIDATES for the above.—Address, 9 Rathbone Place, Oxford Street.

SUMMER TRIP to HOLLAND and BACK in FOUR DAYS, allowing time for a visit to the interesting Cities of Amsterdam, Haarlem, Hague, Scheveningen, or Utrecht. The Favourite Steamers *Batavier* and *Maasdam* leave London alternately every Wednesday and Saturday for Rotterdam, embarking Passengers from Brunswick Wharf, Blackwall. Return Fare: Saloon, £1 10s.; First Cabin, £1 5s.; including Steward's Fee, but exclusive of Provisions supplied on board.—Apply at Chaplin's Universal Office, Regent's Circus, W., or to Phillips, Graves, Phillips, & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Cross Lane, Great Tower Street, E.C.

SUMMER TRIP to SWEDEN and BACK in SEVEN DAYS, allowing time for a visit to the magnificent Waterfalls at Trollhattan, the beautiful lakes Wener and Wettern, with unrivalled surrounding scenery. The twin screw-steamers *London* and *Mary* are despatched from London, Millwall Docks, for Gothenburg every Friday alternately. Fare: Saloon, £3 3s.; Return Ticket, available for one month, £4 14s. 6d. Provisions obtainable on board at tariff prices.—Apply at Chaplin's Universal Office, Regent's Circus, W., or to Phillips, Graves, Phillips, & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Cross Lane, Great Tower Street, E.C., and 25 South John Street, Liverpool.

SUMMER TRIP to GERMANY and BACK in a WEEK, allowing time for a visit to the Harz Mountains, Palace of Wilhelmshöhe, &c.—One of the North German Lloyd's Steamers leave Brunswick Wharf, Blackwall, every Wednesday and Saturday for Bremen. Return Fare: Saloon, £3; First Cabin, £1 10s.; Children under ten years at Half-fare.—Apply at Chaplin's Universal Office, Regent's Circus, W., or to Phillips, Graves, Phillips, & Co., St. Dunstan's House, Cross Lane, Great Tower Street, London, E.C., and 25 South John Street, Liverpool.

FOR COOPER'S HILL, WOOLWICH, and MATHEMATICAL SCHOLARSHIPS.—For List of Honours already gained, address Rev. F. R. DREW, M.A., Senior Master on the Modern Side, Malvern College, Great Malvern. Terms for Boarders, 80 to 90 Guineas including Tuition.

THE Rev. L. HENSLEY, Vicar of Hitchin, Herts, formerly Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge, receives several PUPILS to prepare for the Universities, and has VACANCIES for September 7.

INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE, Cooper's Hill.—CANDIDATES for Admission are specially PREPARED by the Rev. Dr. WRIGLEY, M.A., M.D., F.R.S., formerly Professor of Mathematics, Addiscombe, and late Examiner of Candidates for Appointments in the Indian Civil Engineering Service and Indian Telegraph—Address, 67 High Street, Clapham, S.W.

A MARRIED CLERGYMAN, Incumbent of a Small Parish near Oxford, formerly Tutor in several Families of Distinction, and late Master in a Public School, receives Three or Four PUPILS to prepare for the University. Terms £200. References given and required.—Address, Rev. M. A. OXON, care of Messrs. Masters & Co., 78 New Bond Street, London.

66 AVENUE ROAD, London, N.W.—The Rev. NATHANIEL JENNINGS, M.A., receives STUDENTS for UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, or Pupils for its School, and assists them in preparing for their Classes. The Metropolitan Railway makes the College easily accessible in all kinds of weather. Terms on application.

AN OXFORD GRADUATE, in Honours, an old Marlburian, and late Scholar of his College, receives PUPILS.—Address, Rev. W. EMMA, Great Blakenham, Ipswich.

LADIES' SCHOOL, TAUNTON, for the DAUGHTERS of GENTLEMEN.—The Education given is a thoroughly sound one, and the assistance of experienced Masters is procured in the study of those branches of learning which are often omitted in the Education of Ladies. The real work done is tested by the College of Preceptors, and the Oxford Local Examinations, and by Examinations in the School itself. 7 Pupils passed the Senior Oxford, and 6 the Junior, in the June Examinations, 1873-74; and at the Christmas Examinations of the College of Preceptors, 17 Third-Class, 14 Second-Class, and 5 First-Class, including Special and Honour Certificates, were gained by the Pupils; and the College First Prize for English Subjects at both Examinations. Prospectuses forwarded on application to Miss REED, Mary Street House, Taunton. The next Term will begin on September 21.

TO INDIAN RESIDENTS and GUARDIANS.—A LADY, with unexceptional references in London and Liverpool, desires the entire Charge of TWO LITTLE GIRLS, who would receive every kindness and undivided attention. Healthy country residence within easy reach of Sea-bathing. 2 Inclusive terms £100 each.—Address, H. WASSBY, Esq., Messrs. Wansley & Bowen, Solicitors, 50 Moorgate Street, London.

BRIGHTON COLLEGE.—The FRENCH and GERMAN MASTER, Mr. C. H. WALL, receives BOARDERS. French is always spoken, and can be thoroughly acquired without interruption to other work. The College instruction is supplemented by House Teaching. Special care is given to young Boys intended for the Army, Civil Service, &c. Arrangements can be made for the holidays. College and Boarding-house Fees, Eighty to Ninety Guineas. Mr. WALL has been Eleven years at the College.

MORNING or DAILY GOVERNESS.—A LADY of experience desires a RE-ENGAGEMENT for the September quarter. The neighbourhood of Notting Hill and Shepherd's Bush preferred. Thorough English, French, Music, Drawing, rudimentary Latin and German. Excellent references.—Address, E. H., care of Mrs. Lake, 31 Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury, W.C.

PUPILS WANTED.—MACLURE & MACDONALD, Lithographers to the Queen, having completed their new and spacious buildings in Queen Victoria Street, to which they have now removed, have VACANCIES for a few well-educated young Gentlemen as PUPILS. Applications, with specimens showing capacity, and stating age, may be made to the above address. A moderate premium will be required.—Turret Printing Offices.

SANATORIUM.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill. Physician—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D., Edin. For Invalids and those requiring rest and change. Turkish Baths on the premises.

COMPRESSED AIR BATH.—An important Remedy in various forms of Asthma, Bronchial Affections, Disorders of the Lungs, and Anæmic conditions of the Blood.—TOWNSEND HOUSE, GREAT MALVERN. Physicians—R. B. GRINDROD and C. F. GRINDROD.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel. ROBERT PARK, Manager.

ILFRACOMBE HOTEL, Ilfracombe, North Devon.—Delightful Location. Beautiful Scenery. 250 Rooms. Appointments perfect. Cuisine excellent. Wines choice. Accessible from all parts by Steam and Rail (see Time Tables).

E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange, Manufacturers of CHRONOMETERS, WATCHES, ASTRONOMICAL and TURRET CLOCKS, to Her Majesty, H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, and H.M. the Emperor of Russia; Makers of the Great Clock of the House of Parliament, and of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich. Catalogues on application.—E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand, 34 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), and Factory, Savoy Street, London.

MAPPIN & WEBBS

21 SPOONS and FORKS.

GUARANTEED to LAST

TWENTY YEARS. (PATENTEE OF THE "CLUB" BOTTLE-HOLDER.)

76, 77, and 78 OXFORD STREET, LONDON, WEST END.

MANSION HOUSE BUILDINGS, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, CITY, LONDON.

MANUFACTORY and SHOW ROOMS, THE ROYAL CUTLERY WORKS, SHEFFIELD. COSTLY ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUES ON RECEIPT OF 12 STAMPS. SMALLER EDITION POST FREE.

WOOD TAPESTRY DECORATIONS.—HOWARD'S PATENT.—Wood Tapestry can be applied to all even surfaces, being an adaptation of real wood, in lieu of painting or paper-hanging; beautiful in effect and exceedingly durable. Decorators, 25, 26, & 27 Berners Street, London, W.

W. A. & S. SMEE, having made considerable additions to their Premises, invite inspection of their STOCK OF CABINET and UPHOLSTERY FURNITURE, IRON and BRASS BEDSTEPS, BEDDING AND CARPETS. Now contained in Twenty-two Ware Rooms and Galleries. They have largely increased their Stock of the more moderate-priced Furniture of sound and serviceable quality, whilst they continue to devote great attention to the production of High-class Artistic Furniture, and will send a Book of Designs on application. 6 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, LONDON.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS, Self-Colling. Fire and Theft Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectuses free.—CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

READING EASELS, for Holding Books in any position, over an Easy Chair, Bed, or Sofa, obviating incessant fatigue and stooping while reading. Prices from 21s. BATH CHAIRS, from 41s. INVALID COUCHES, adjustable to any position, with Hair Cushions, 27 10s. BED TABLES, CARRYING CHAIRS, WHEEL CHAIRS, and BED RESTS. Drawings post free. J. CARTER, 6a New Cavendish Street, Great Portland Street, W.

QUEEN'S MANSIONS FREEHOLD TRUST, LIMITED.

(Incorporated under the Companies Act, 1862 and 1867.)

Trust Fund, £285,000, viz.:

Perpetual Mortgage Debentures, of £100 each, bearing 5 per cent. per annum interest..	£190,000
Shares of £20 each, entitled to the net surplus rentals (estimated to yield at least 7 per cent. per annum).....	95,000
	£285,000

The Property constituting this Trust will be Freehold, and free from incumbrances.

Trustees.

The Hon. FREDERICK WALPOLE, M.P.
E. K. KARS LAKE, Esq., Q.C.

Committee of Management.

GEORGE BATTOCK, Esq., Director of the Mutual Life Assurance Society, London.
Sir THOMAS DAKIN, Alderman, Director of the London and Lancashire Life Assurance, London.
H. HARWOOD HARWOOD, Esq., J.P., Director of the Mutual Life Assurance Society, London.
Major-General HITCHINS, R.E., United Service Club, Pall Mall, London.
PHILIP HEMERY LE BRETON, Esq., Member of the Metropolitan Board of Works.
GEORGE J. MAYHEW, Esq., Great George Street, Westminster.

Bankers—LONDON AND COUNTY BANK, Lombard Street, London.

Solicitors—Messrs. BURCHELL, 5 Broad Sanctuary, Westminster.

Architect—JAMES KNOWLES, Esq., 17 Albert Mansions, Victoria Street.

Auditors—Messrs. COOPER BROTHERS & CO., George Street, Mansion House.

Secretary—A. P. HOBSON, Esq.

OFFICES—4 VICTORIA STREET, WESTMINSTER.

The London and County Bank and its Branches will, on behalf of the above Committee of Management, receive applications for £100,000 Perpetual Mortgage Five per Cent. Debentures and £95,000 in Shares of £20 each, which together constitute the amount of this Trust.

ABRIDGED PROSPECTUS.

This Trust is constituted to meet the requirements of Trustees and others who look for absolute security, and a moderate but certain rate of interest upon the sum invested.

The property of the Trust will consist solely of Freehold Land and Buildings.

It is well known that many persons are desirous of investing upon freehold security, but are prevented by the difficulty in obtaining mortgages, especially for small amounts, and at remunerative rates of interest. These difficulties will be removed by this Trust, which will afford the desired security without trouble or delay either in the first investment or its transfer.

The Debentures will be a first charge on the entire net rentals and income of the Trust for a fixed interest of 5 per cent. per annum, payable half-yearly.

The Shares, although ranking after the Debentures in point of security, are believed to be a thoroughly safe and secure investment, while the rate of dividend thereon is likely to be much higher than the interest on the Debentures.

Applicants for Shares who wish to apply also for Debentures will be entitled to priority in the allotment of such Debentures to the extent of double the amount of their application for Shares, but applications may be made for Shares only or Debentures only.

The only agreement is for the purchase of the site, and is dated July 23, 1874, and made between ALFRED LUCETTE on the one part, and ARTHUR PERMISTON HOBSON, on behalf of the Company, on the other part; this, together with the Articles of Association, may be seen at the Offices of the Solicitors, Messrs. BURCHELL, 5 Broad Sanctuary, Westminster.

Prospectus and Forms of Application can be obtained of the Bankers, the Solicitors, or of the Secretary.

London, August 4, 1874.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized. Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

LEGAL and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, 10 FLEET STREET, TEMPLE BAR.—Founded 1836.

At the recent Bonus Investigation the reserves against all liabilities were determined upon the strictest and most cautious principles known to Actuaries.

The value of the protection thus afforded to Policy-holders is clearly explained by the Directors' Report.

The Bonus declared, after thus providing the highest known order of security, was unusually large.

The Assured receive nine-tenths of the Profits.

The Society has taken a leading part in freeing Assurance contracts from complication. The Policies are "indisputable."

The guaranteeing Capital of One Million is held by nearly three hundred members of the Legal Profession.

E. A. NEWTON, Actuary and Manager.

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1803.

1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 & 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,600,000. PAID-UP and INVESTED, £700,000.

E. COZENS SMITH, General Manager.

PHENIX FIRE OFFICE, LOMBARD STREET AND CHANCERY CROSS, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1782.

Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

GEORGE WM. LOVELL } Secretaries.
JOHN J. BROOMFIELD }

LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, Fleet Street, London.

Invested assets on December 31, 1873

Income for the past year

Amount paid on death to December last

Forms of proposal, &c., will be sent on application at the Office.

LONDON and SOUTHWARK FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE.

Chairman—HENRY ASTE, Esq.

CHIEF OFFICE—73 and 74 KING WILLIAM STREET, E.C.

CARSON'S PAINT.

PATRONIZED BY THE QUEEN.

The British, Indian, and Colonial Governments, 8,000 of the Nobility, Gentry, and Clergy, Railway and Canal Companies, Collieries, Ironmasters, &c. &c.

Is extensively used for all kinds of

OUT-DOOR WORK.

It is especially applicable to WOOD, IRON, BRICK, STONE, and COMPO.

Can be laid on by Unskilled Labour.

SOLD IN ALL COLOURS. TWO CWT. FREE TO ALL STATIONS.

Prices, Patterns, and Testimonials sent Post Free.

WALTER CARSON & SONS,

LA BELLE SAUVAGE YARD, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C.;

AND 21 BACHELOR'S WALK, DUBLIN.

No Agents.